

Camacho, Maria Zoraida Tan, and Arsenia V. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN (by request):

H.R. 6209. A bill for the relief of Wesley Crump; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6210. A bill for the relief of Ethel McLeod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 6211. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 6212. A bill for the relief of Antonio S. Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria da Conceicao Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 6214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chung Sook Paik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6215. A bill for the relief of Chang Ghoo-ne Yi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 6216. A bill for the relief of Paulina Crisci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 6217. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Moallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 6218. A bill for the relief of William E. Neu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6219. A bill for the relief of Alexander Allferis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6220. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Grimbilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6221. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6222. A bill for the relief of Antonia Grimbila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6223. A bill for the relief of Luigi Viekoslav Pirjavec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (by request):

H.R. 6224. A bill for the relief of Mario Cianciulli and his wife, Candida Cianciulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 6225. A bill for the relief of Errol George Minto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6226. A bill for the relief of Muriel C. Greaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6227. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Rebecca Riley Black; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Lloyd T. Eastburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 6229. A bill for the relief of William Wallace Division, Wallace-Murray Corp. (formerly William Wallace Co.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 320. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 6190, for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

37. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to Federal income tax returns, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in foolish futility in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock.

Enable Thy servants in this place of governance, in the discharge of great responsibilities of public trust, to be calm, confident, wise, and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast.

Make us honest and honorable enough to bear the vision of the truth, wherever it may lead; to cast aside all pretense; and expediency which warp the soul.

Give us, O God, the strength to build The city that hath stood Too long a dream, whose laws are love, Whose ways are brotherhood: And where the sun that shineth is God's grace for human good.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the light and the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States: I am transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1967.

This plan would transfer from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Transportation authority to approve the surrender of certain ship documents. These documents include certificates of ownership, declarations of citizenship, and related ship papers issued for commercial vessels covered by preferred mortgages or owned by the United States.

Under the act establishing the Depart-

ment of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Coast Guard, will have responsibility for recording bills of sale, transfers, and mortgages of ships; for issuing new marine documents; and for retaining custody of preferred mortgages on vessels.

The Secretary of Transportation will not, however, have the authority to approve the surrender of documents for vessels covered by preferred mortgages. That authority still resides with the Secretary of Commerce.

As a result, shipowners will have to deal with two separate departments of the Federal Government every time a ship's name is changed, its structure is modified, or it is sold or transferred.

In each of these and other cases, the shipowner must first seek the approval of the Secretary of Commerce to surrender the ship's documents and then request the Secretary of Transportation to issue new documents.

The reorganization plan is designed to eliminate this duplication of effort, and to save time and expense for shipowners.

This is not a major reorganization plan. But it is important. It is part of our larger effort to streamline the Government, to make its operations as efficient as possible, and to enable it to provide better service to the citizens and businessmen of this country.

This plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title V of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that the reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of that title.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 1967.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 61)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the District of Columbia. Without objection, the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and will be appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our goal for the Nation's Capital is a city of which all Americans can be proud.

As I said 2 years ago, this city and its government must be, for its residents and the entire world, "a living expression of the highest ideals of democratic government." It should be a city of beauty and inspiration, of equal justice and opportunity. It should be a model for every American city, large and small. It should be a city in which our citizens and our friends from abroad can live and work, visit our great national monuments, and enjoy our parks and walk our streets without fear.

The District of Columbia is the Na-

tion's ninth largest city. It is the center of the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country, with a population today of 2.5 million. As such, its citizens have all the problems—and are entitled to all the rights—of the citizens of any large city in this country.

The District of Columbia is also the Capital of our Nation, and the seat of every major agency of the Federal Government. As such, there is a significant Federal interest in the affairs of this city.

Since I have been President, I have addressed myself to the difficult problem of balancing the interest of the residents of the District as citizens of a large city with that of the National Government as representative of the people of the entire country.

The actions of the 89th Congress demonstrate that it shares my concern that both these interests be fairly served. While the 89th Congress did not move forward in every field as many of us would have preferred, its accomplishments do illustrate our mutual interest in making the District of Columbia a place in which we can all take pride:

A new 4-year college and a technical institute were authorized to bring better education and training to our young.

A mass transit system was authorized to serve the city and its suburbs and an interstate agency was created to plan and build the system.

A comprehensive minimum wage law was enacted.

Urban renewal was started for the commercial area in the heart of the city.

Two new museums, the Hirshhorn and the Air and Space, were authorized.

A Commission to plan a Visitor's Center was established. These actions are an important, and a very historic beginning. The District's programs for housing, education, health, welfare, and recreation must be expanded and improved. Its war against crime must be sharply stepped up.

The 1968 budget for the District calls for increased efforts in each of these areas. The budget would finance long-delayed school construction projects. It would provide the personnel and equipment needed to enhance the quality of education. It would provide resources vitally needed by the police and it would enable us to combat crime at its source with improved housing, education, training, health and rehabilitation services.

But prompt action on the 1968 budget alone is not enough.

The citizens of the District are entitled to:

Elect the government which serves them.

Efficient and effective government machinery.

Representation in the Congress of the United States.

Streets and homes that are free from crime and the fear of crime.

The citizens of our Nation, as well as those of the District, are entitled to a Capital that is—

Inspiring, dignified and beautiful.

A place where the great scholars of the Nation and the world can come to work, study, and learn.

A hospitable location for the scores of

foreign governments which are represented here.

Accessible by transportation convenient to all who visit here.

I. A BETTER GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia, as a major American city and the center of a large metropolitan area, faces all the problems of explosive urbanization—a rising crime rate, traffic congestion and parking shortages, decaying buildings and homes and inadequate health and education services. To meet these needs, the District must have the most responsive and efficient government we are capable of providing.

I recommend a three-point program to bring new vitality and strength to the District's government: Home rule, reorganization and strengthening of the District government, representation in the Congress.

HOME RULE

To provide a system of government appropriate for the people who live here and worthy of our heritage, the residents of the District of Columbia must be given a voice in the selection of their local officials.

The citizens of the District today have no voice in the government of their city. Despite the principle so long cherished in this country, they are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship and at the same time denied one of its most fundamental rights.

This continuing denial of democracy is an affront to our traditions and to the citizens who make the District their home.

The need for home rule stems from practical considerations as well. Management of any large metropolitan center, in this era of rapid technological and social change, must be promptly responsive to new demands and new conditions. The Congress, preoccupied as it should be with the problems of this great Nation, cannot be expected to provide the day-to-day management that should be provided by locally elected officials. The 535 Members of Congress should not be expected to serve as city councilmen for the city of Washington.

The bill to provide self-government for the District, which I transmitted to the 89th Congress, was designed to afford local citizens a full voice in their affairs and at the same time provide adequate safeguards for the legitimate interests of the Federal Government in our Nation's Capital. The Senate passed that bill. While the House of Representatives did not pass the bill I submitted, a majority of its Members clearly went on record in support of the principle of home rule.

I again endorse the home rule bill.

As I said in my message on the District of Columbia budget:

I believe that the last Congress should have granted home rule to the citizens of the District, and I urge the present Congress to give them home rule.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

Improvements in District government need not await the passage of home rule

legislation. Interim action under the Reorganization Act can bring urgently needed improvements to make the present unwieldy structure into an efficient and effective instrument of municipal government.

I will shortly transmit to the Congress a reorganization proposal to strengthen and modernize the government of the District of Columbia.

The present District government organization was established almost a century ago. The District was then a community of 150,000 people. Less than 500 persons were employed by its government.

Today the District has 800,000 residents. Its government employs some 30,000 people. Its 1968 budget is more than half a billion dollars. This major metropolis cannot be properly governed with the cumbersome machinery of an archaic and obsolete structure.

The District is entitled to have the best and most efficient municipal government we can provide. The Nation's Capital should lead the country in applying the techniques of modern management to the organization and administration of its programs.

The reorganization plan I propose would create a mayor-council form of government—the form which has been found most successful in the Nation's 27 largest cities.

Under the reorganization plan, the President, subject to Senate confirmation, would appoint from among District residents a single Commissioner as chief executive and a Council of nine members.

The single Commissioner would serve at the pleasure of the President. Council members would serve 2-year terms, five to be appointed one year and four the next. The staggered terms would insure continuity of experience on the Council.

The powers and responsibilities which the three-man Board of Commissioners presently have would be apportioned between the single Commissioner and the Council. The Commissioner would be assigned the executive functions now vested in the Board of Commissioners. Like most mayors, he would be given responsibility and authority to organize and manage the District government, to administer its programs, and to prepare its budget of revenues and expenses.

The Council would be responsible primarily for making local rules and regulations—the District's city ordinances. This would include the quasi-legislative functions which are now performed by the Board of Commissioners, such as licensing rules, the issuance of police regulations, and the establishment of rates for property taxation. It would also review and approve the Commissioner's budget for submission to the President.

This reorganization would unify executive and administrative authority in a single Commissioner. While the District has been fortunate in the caliber and dedication of men who have become Commissioners, divided executive authority cannot provide effective management for the municipal affairs of a city of almost 1 million people.

The Capital City of this Nation can no longer afford government by three heads—each wearing several hats. To achieve their maximum potential, Dis-

strict programs—and federally assisted programs in the District—require clear-cut executive authority and flexible government machinery at the local level—not divided authority which too often produces prolonged negotiations and inaction. A single executive can bring effective management, direction, and control to the task of meeting increasingly complex needs.

But reorganization alone will not assure the Nation's Capital the best municipal government. The District must also be able to attract and hold top men in the widely varying fields required for effective city government.

I recommend legislation to give the District government an ample quota of its own top executive-level positions—supergrades and levels IV and V. The District government must be able to offer attractive salaries and opportunities for career advancement if it is to draw the caliber of person which the government of the Nation's Capital deserves.

As these fundamental changes are made, it will be possible to effect further improvements, both in the structure of the District government and in its relationships to other agencies serving the Nation's Capital.

These proposals in no way substitute for home rule. The single Commissioner and the nine-man Council will give the District a better organized and more efficient government, but they will have no functions beyond those the three Commissioners now possess. The new structure will make the transition to self-government easier, but only home rule will provide the District with a democratic government—of, by, and for its citizens.

REPRESENTATION IN THE CONGRESS

A proper complement to locally elected District officials is locally elected voting representation in the Congress.

I recommend that the Constitution be amended to authorize one Representative for the District of Columbia in the House and such additional representation in the House and the Senate as the Congress may from time to time provide.

Upon ratification, this would give the District of Columbia at least one sure voice—the minimum possible voting representation—in the Congress. At the same time, it would provide, through the Congress, the ability to adjust the representation for the District as population increases and as other changes make such adjustments appropriate and fair.

Ratification by the States and enactment by the necessary implementing legislation will take some time. But District citizens should not be left completely without a voice in the Congress during this vital interim period. They are entitled to some representation in the Congress now.

I recommend legislation to permit the citizens of the District to elect a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives. Such a delegate would be comparable to the delegates who formerly represented Hawaii and Alaska and to the present Resident Commissioner for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

A delegate from the District in the House of Representatives would be of

benefit to both the Congress and the District in providing a more adequate line of communication on District matters. A collateral benefit would be the opportunity for District citizens, through the experience of biennial elections, to develop additional local leadership and more effective political organizations responsive to the citizens who live here.

II. THE WAR ON CRIME

In my message to the Congress on crime in America, I said:

Lawlessness is like a plague. Its costs, whether economic, physical or psychological, are spread through every alley and every street in every neighborhood. It creates a climate in which people make choices, not out of confidence, but out of fear.

That plague has struck our Nation's Capital. But, as I said in that same message:

We can control crime if we will. We must act boldly, now, to treat ancient evils and to insure the public safety.

In my 1965 message on the District of Columbia, I announced the establishment of the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia and asked for additional policemen, special incentives to attract and hold first-rate policemen, improvements in our courts to handle the growing criminal caseload, new correctional techniques to break the cycle of crime, prison, release, and crime.

The Congress responded, and in the past 2 years there have been significant advances. Working together, we have increased police salaries, authorized overtime compensation for police officers, provided additional judgeships in the court of general sessions, established a work release program for misdemeanor offenders, and created a District of Columbia Bail Agency.

Through the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, the Department of Justice has provided funds to support development of a model police radio communications system, a police planning bureau, an in-service police training program for all staff levels, a computerized law enforcement information system for the metropolitan area, additional mobile units.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have issued orders reorganizing the Police Department and the Department of Corrections to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

These are significant steps forward. But more—much more—remains to be done.

In December 1966, the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia submitted a comprehensive report on the nature and extent of the District's crime problem and on the quality of the District's response to it. The report assembled facts, carefully explored alternatives and presented a broad and practical program for action.

The Crime Commission reported that since 1960 the rate of homicides and housebreakings in the District has doubled, the rate of robberies and auto thefts has almost tripled, the rate of grand larcenies has increased by more than 50 percent.

The Commission's report emphasizes that any meaningful attack on crime involves comprehensive and persistent ac-

tion over a period of several years. The report makes the priorities clear. We must develop new programs to deal with juvenile delinquency, develop and use the most effective law enforcement machinery available, strengthen our courts and prosecutors so that persons charged with crime can be tried quickly and fairly, guarantee that our rehabilitative efforts reflect the wisest experience in the field of corrections, so that we can break the vicious cycle of crime, prison, and more crime, develop an information and evaluation system which permits rapid appraisal of our efforts to control crime.

Measured against the demands of these goals, piecemeal efforts will not suffice. Crime will not be controlled by strengthening just one or two agencies in the field. All parts of the government with law enforcement and criminal justice responsibilities must be strengthened. Private citizens must participate at every level—from support for the police and promptly reporting crimes, to testifying in court and employing good risk offenders.

THE COMMITMENT

Crime in the sixties and seventies can no more be fought with inadequate budgets and obsolete tools than with words of public indignation. The District of Columbia needs financial resources to provide the manpower, training, new facilities, and equipment and information systems—to prevent crime before it occurs, to process offenders swiftly and to develop programs which prevent repetition of crime by offenders and return them to useful lives.

Equally important, the police and government officials of the District need the personal support of every citizen who lives here and of the Congress. So long as I am President, I will take every step necessary to control crime in the District and to make it a community of safe streets and homes, free from crime and the fear of crime.

My message on the District's budget described some of the efforts we must make: A further increase in police salaries, additional funds to improve police planning, communications, and transportation, more police officers, particularly sergeants to improve supervision, additional funds for our efforts to curb juvenile delinquency, expanded assistance for the planning, construction, and modernization of courts and correctional facilities.

To support these efforts, I am requesting \$11.6 million—a 20-percent increase—in the fiscal 1968 appropriations for the District police, courts, and correctional activities. I urge the Congress to act promptly on this vital request.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Action on the District's budget alone is not enough. Our laws—and the weapons of those who enforce our laws—must be strengthened. I propose a 10-point program to achieve this objective.

1. GUN CONTROL

Pistols are relatively easy to purchase in the District of Columbia. As the Crime Commission found, "almost anyone who is willing to fill out a form and

wait for 48 hours can buy a handgun." The only persons who may not purchase handguns are minors, the mentally ill, drug addicts, and convicted felons. It makes no difference whether the individual has any need to purchase a pistol. Pistols may also be purchased by mail without restriction.

Any person who is not a felon or drug addict may possess a pistol in the District. It makes no difference whether he is mentally ill, a minor, or a chronic alcoholic, whether the weapon was obtained legally or illegally or whether there is any need for possession of the weapon.

Between July 1, 1965, and June 30, 1966, 1,850 major crimes were committed in the District of Columbia with pistols: 73 homicides, 640 assaults, 1,137 robberies and attempted robberies.

No civilized community in the 20th century should permit a situation such as this to exist. Experience in cities that regulate the purchase and possession of handguns and the studies of the Crime Commission clearly show that strict controls can strengthen our efforts to reduce violent crimes. Such controls cannot eliminate the danger of violence in our society. But they can help keep lethal weapons out of dangerous and irresponsible hands.

As the District Crime Commission emphasized, New York City, with the most stringent pistol control law in the country, has many crimes committed with handguns, but the relative number of such crimes is significantly less than in the District.

The District had a handgun murder rate of 9.1 per 100,000 of population in fiscal 1966, New York City had a rate of only 1.7. The handgun assault rate was 79.8 in the District, but only 20 in New York. The handgun robbery rate was 141.7 in the District, but only 45.4 in New York.

I recommend legislation to:

Prohibit possession of firearms by minors, chronic alcoholics, and the mentally ill, as well as felons and drug addicts who are covered by existing law.

Prohibit purchase of firearms by chronic alcoholics, as well as minors, the mentally ill, felons, and drug addicts who are now covered.

Require that any person desiring to purchase, possess, or carry a pistol in public obtain a license which will be granted only if he can show that he needs the weapon to protect his person or property.

Prohibit anyone from carrying rifles and shotguns in public, unless unloaded and properly encased.

Authorize the courts to impose increased penalties where a firearm is used in the commission of a robbery.

2. POWER TO ARREST WITHOUT A WARRANT

At present District police officers are authorized to arrest without a warrant only when they have reason to believe that the person has committed an armed robbery, murder, or some other felony, or one of a limited number of misdemeanors, such as possession of narcotics or carrying a concealed weapon. The police today may not arrest a person whom they believe has committed other serious

offenses, such as an assault or unlawful entry, without first obtaining a warrant for his arrest.

I recommend legislation to extend the authority of police to arrest without a warrant to additional serious offenses, such as assault, unlawful entry, and attempted housebreaking. This will allow the police to respond more quickly and effectively to criminal acts threatening serious harm to our citizens.

3. WITNESSES

Of vital importance to crime control and any criminal prosecution is the availability of witnesses and their freedom from threats and intimidation.

Existing laws provide ample protections against intimidation of witnesses—but only after charges have been filed. It is not a crime to bribe or threaten persons with vital information before charges have been filed.

I recommend that the obstruction of justice statute be extended to cover interference with criminal investigations before charges have been filed.

In addition, the power of police to take custody of material witnesses at the scene of a crime must be clarified.

I recommend that the police of the District of Columbia be given authority to take custody of a material witness whenever there is reason to believe that he will not be available to testify in court. After the witness has been taken into custody, he would be promptly brought before a judicial officer who could either set conditions upon his release to insure reappearance or make arrangements for taking his deposition prior to release.

4. CITATIONS BEFORE AND AFTER ARREST FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES

District police today spend enormous amounts of time guarding and transporting persons arrested for minor offenses. Even where the offense is minor and identity of the offender clear, the police must in each case arrest the offender and take him to the stationhouse before he can be released with orders to reappear for trial or a hearing to determine whether a trial should be held. This must be done even if the offense involves nothing more than annoying a neighbor or refusing to move on when asked by some local official. This results in an inexcusable waste of police time and energy and often prevents the police from fulfilling more important duties.

New York, California, and several other States have resolved this problem by authorizing the police to issue citations to persons they consider reliable to require a subsequent appearance in court or at the police station.

I recommend legislation to give the police discretion to issue citations for certain minor offenses requiring subsequent appearance by the suspect.

Under this proposal, the court of general sessions would determine the types of offenses which would fall within this procedure. The proposal would enable the police to release reliable persons at the place of arrest or the stationhouse, thus conserving valuable police time for more important crime detection and protection duties.

5. BAIL SUPERVISION

Much can—and should—be done to improve our bail practices.

We are now making every effort to speed up the judicial process, to shorten the periods between arrest and trial and between conviction and appeal. This would limit the period during which the suspect is at large pending trial or appeal.

In addition, we must minimize the risk to society created by releasing persons before their trial.

I recommend legislation to permit the Department of Corrections to supervise persons released pending trial. This legislation would make possible more careful supervision of persons released on bail and would help the released person obtain needed counseling and assistance.

6. PROCEDURES UPON PLEA OF INSANITY

Existing procedures governing the defense of insanity contribute neither to judicial efficiency nor to protection of the rights of criminal defendants. A criminal defendant need not notify the prosecution or the court that he intends to raise the defense of insanity. He can wait until the prosecution has completed the presentation of its case and then submit this complex defense.

As a result the prosecutor must either make extensive and costly preparations which may not be necessary or enter the trial unprepared to deal with the issue. If the prosecution is not prepared and insanity is raised, a delay in the trial is unavoidable. But even where the trial is delayed, the government may not have sufficient time to prepare its case properly.

I recommend that counsel for a defendant who proposes to plead insanity be required to give advance notice to the prosecution.

This would protect the public against needless expense, where insanity is not in issue. It would protect the courts, the prosecution, and the defendant against needless delay, where insanity is unexpectedly raised.

7. CIVIL COMMITMENT FOR NARCOTICS OFFENSES

Last year I proposed the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act to permit civil commitment of certain narcotic addicts. As I said at that time:

Our continued insistence on treating drug addicts, once apprehended, as criminals is neither humane nor effective. It has neither curtailed nor prevented crime.

I now recommend legislation to broaden the act's applicability in the District of Columbia.

Full criminal sanctions must be retained against the pushers who peddle narcotics—those who corrupt our children and destroy the lives of the young on whom they prey. But we must begin to provide treatment for those who are addicted to drugs. We must attempt "to eliminate the hunger for drugs that leads so many into lives of crime and degradation."

8. ALCOHOLIC OFFENSES

In fiscal 1965 there were 44,000 arrests for intoxication in the District of Columbia. This represents 50 percent of all nontraffic arrests. A few of these arrests

were accompanied by assaults or other serious offenses. Most, however, involved nothing more than intoxication—and often just the intoxication of a chronic alcoholic.

This represents a tremendous waste of resources—police, courts, and prisons. Alcoholism, as both the National and District Crime Commissions pointed out, is not a criminal problem. It is a health problem. Alcoholics should not be arrested. They should be treated.

I recommend that the laws of the District be clarified so that police and Health Department personnel can take intoxicated persons not to a jail, but to a medical facility where they can receive proper treatment. Intoxication would be a criminal offense only when accompanied by conduct which endangers other persons or property.

9. CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

The criminal code of the District needs complete modernization and revision. It was last codified three quarters of a century ago. The District Crime Commission cites many examples of vague, confusing, archaic, and conflicting provisions of substance and procedure. The District should have a coherent and consistent framework for the arrest and punishment of offenders and the control of crime.

I recommend the establishment of a Commission on Reform of Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia to review, modernize, and clarify the District's Criminal Code. The 11-man Commission would be composed of representatives from the House and Senate, from the courts of the District and from the public at large.

10. CRIMINAL STATISTICS

The District must have a reliable means of discovering the effectiveness of its efforts to control crime. The report of the Crime Commission points out substantial gaps in the criminal information system. Police, courts, and correctional and juvenile institutions maintain separate and uncoordinated records, often creating conflicts in statistics and leaving the community without a comprehensive view of its criminal process. More significant, the policymakers in the District and the senior police officials lack the information essential to evaluate new and lasting crime control programs.

I have asked the District Commissioners to create a Bureau of Criminal Statistics. The Bureau would supply crime control agencies in the District with accurate data essential to their planning and evaluation functions and would end duplication of effort in data collection.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The District must be given the total resources necessary to mount an effective attack on crime. Its laws—and law-enforcement officers—must be strengthened. But we must also improve our techniques for crime prevention, for processing offenders, and for rehabilitating the convicted.

We must make additional efforts to stop crime where it most frequently begins—with the young offender:

In the 16 years from 1950 to 1965, nearly one-third of the persons arrested

in the District for serious crimes were under 18.

In 1965 arrests of youth offenders under 18 for serious crimes increased by 53 percent over 1960; adult arrests decreased 11 percent during this same period.

In 1965, children 15 years and younger accounted for 36 percent of all house-breaking arrests and 27 percent of all robbery and auto theft arrests.

In January 1967, there were more youth offenders referred to the Juvenile Court than in any prior month.

The Crime Commission's report stresses the need for improving our efforts to rehabilitate our young offenders and restore them to useful and productive lives. But as the Commission stated:

The most productive approach for both the potential offender and the community is to prevent delinquency before it begins.

It will be neither simple nor cheap to halt the growth of juvenile crime. But we must commit the necessary resources. I have recommended in the budget urgently needed funds to strengthen and improve a variety of District programs—education, recreation, health and welfare, and the Juvenile Court.

I have requested funds for a major summer program which will provide recreation, training, and employment for disadvantaged youth.

I have also asked for funds to expand the Roving Leader program which has had such marked success in dealing with gangs and delinquency-prone youth. These funds will permit the expansion of programs removing the causes of delinquency as well as the improvement of the various rehabilitative services afforded the youth in trouble.

Consistency in these efforts, coordination of present youth programs, public and private, and development of new prevention techniques are essential. The Crime Commission proposed that a Youth Services Office be established to carry out these responsibilities.

I recommend legislation to establish a District Youth Services Office to plan and direct all the services needed to combat juvenile delinquency.

This Office, recommended by the District Crime Commission, would encourage maximum efforts by public and private agencies, as well as by private individuals. It would make available through one source all the specialized services—counseling, remedial education, vocational training, employment assistance, and health and recreational services—needed by the young, their parents, school personnel, and other persons working with the youth of the District. It would test new ways to prevent and control delinquency and to restore the troubled youth to a satisfying and productive life.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

We must make improvements in the administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

The report of the Crime Commission's study of the District courts is particularly disturbing. The Commission points out that offenders are released and not tried—not from any deliberate

policy of leniency or softness, but rather from the pressures of sheer numbers and impossible caseloads.

In fiscal 1966, the number of felony prosecutions was substantially less than it was 15 years ago—in the face of a substantial increase in the amount of crime and the number of arrests.

In fiscal 1965, only 15 percent of the adult felony charges filed by the police resulted in felony prosecutions in the District court.

An efficient police department is not enough. We must have a judicial system fully capable of dealing swiftly and fairly with persons arrested by the police.

The courts and the bar are already engaged in serious efforts to find solutions. The District court and the court of general sessions have made significant strides in improving their procedures for handling criminal cases.

The judicial council of the District of Columbia Circuit is preparing recommendations on ways to handle the staggering—and increasing—caseload of the court of general sessions, and to improve the processing of criminal cases in all of our courts. One promising method being explored is a program for round-the-clock processing of arrested persons and night sessions of court.

The judicial council is also at work on another recommendation of the Crime Commission—the proposal for a family court which would assume the responsibilities of the juvenile court, the domestic relations branch of the court of general sessions, and the Mental Health Commission.

The need to find solutions remains urgent. I pledge the continuing cooperation and assistance of the executive branch to these efforts. I have asked the District Commissioners and the Acting Attorney General to review promptly any recommendations for improving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia made by the courts or the judicial council and to take appropriate action to implement them.

CORRECTIONS

We must make improvements in the rehabilitation of the convicted offender. The report of the Crime Commission makes clear that the problem which the District faces is not too much probation and parole.

The Crime Commission's report revealed that two-thirds of those convicted of felonies in the District have already served at least one prison term. In addition, the Commission found that more than one-half of the felony offenders were unemployed when they committed their most recent crime.

No matter how long the sentences, most prisoners will eventually be returned to the community. The quality of the help they receive in prison and after release in building new lives for themselves makes the critical difference.

The District's correctional system is in need of modern facilities, more specialized personnel to provide counseling and vocational training, "halfway" houses to provide support during the critical release period and community support to provide employment for persons with criminal records.

The budget I have recommended to the Congress will permit the District to begin to overcome these deficiencies and to plan to meet the needs of the future. It will:

Permit planning of a modern detention, diagnostic, and treatment facility to replace the District jail and the District Receiving Home.

Allow closer supervision and improved counseling, training, and employment services for prisoners before and after release.

Provide greater services for youth offenders and an expanded work-training program to assist in the transition from jail to meaningful employment.

I strongly urge prompt and favorable action on these recommendations.

I also recommend that the Federal Prison Industries be authorized to manage and operate the industrial program of the District's correctional institutions. This agency, which has an enviable record of success in Federal prisons, will provide valuable assistance to the District in improving prison vocational training and employment opportunities.

This is the immediate battle plan in a total campaign to assure law and order for the District. Some parts require legislation. Some require funds. Some require improvements in procedures that courts, agencies, and administrators can themselves put into effect. A failure on any front in this war weakens the efforts on all the others. Every course must be pursued. We must not fail.

I pledge myself—and I urge the Congress—to take every step which is necessary to ultimate success in our drive against crime. We must pursue every avenue and use every weapon which holds promise of advancing this effort. We will need the total commitment and cooperation of every man and woman in the District, if we are to have a city where civic order and social justice prevail.

As I said in my message on crime in America:

Public order is the first business of government.

III. THE DISTRICT AS THE CAPITAL

The District, as the Nation's Capital, must be able to serve the national purpose for which it was founded. Its great avenues must be preserved as a tribute to the past and an inspiration for the future. It should afford unparalleled opportunities for the great scholars of the country and the world. It must make every effort to meet the needs of emissaries from abroad. It must continually explore new ways to improve its overloaded transportation facilities.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Avenue, the District's most important thoroughfare, is the symbolic link between the White House and the Capitol. Throughout our history it has been the scene of ceremonies celebrating our triumphs and our tragedies.

Yet it has been allowed to wear down and become unworthy of its role. A temporary Commission created by Executive order is now engaged in bringing to the avenue the dignity and grandeur which it should have.

I recommend that the Congress support these efforts by prompt approval of the bill establishing a statutory Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.

WOODROW WILSON CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, created by the Congress in 1961, recently recommended the establishment of a Center for Scholars at Market Square as a living memorial to that great President.

The proposal of the Woodrow Wilson Commission has much to commend it. Because of its broad educational aspects, I am appointing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. I am asking him, in consultation with the Commission, to conduct a study to develop a detailed proposal for the Center. When that study is completed, I will make further recommendations to the Congress.

It is my hope that the Center will serve as a place for bringing together scholars and students from other countries to increase understanding among peoples of the world, as well as an important educational institution.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For the District to serve its purpose as the Nation's Capital, it must provide for the representatives of foreign governments and international organizations. Increasingly, the unavailability of space for the legitimate needs of foreign governments is becoming a matter of concern.

Many new countries require but have been unable to secure adequate space for their chanceries. Many older countries which are seeking larger quarters are having similar difficulties. The problem has become an unnecessary irritant in our international relationships.

I recommend legislation which, consistent with the legitimate interests of District citizens, would specify an area northwest of Washington Circle to be available for foreign chanceries and the offices of international organizations.

The bill would authorize the Federal Government to acquire land in this area for appropriate disposition, as the Secretary of State may determine, to foreign governments and international organizations.

TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Last year, important decisions by the Congress and by local government agencies cleared the way for the development of highway and mass transit systems required to handle the growing transportation needs of the National Capital region. Meanwhile, the National Capital Planning Commission is recommending that a major transportation center be developed in the vicinity of the Union Station, where railroads, mass transit, and highways will come together.

I am asking the Planning Commission to take the lead, in cooperation with other agencies, to conduct a detailed study of this recommendation and to determine how such a center might be designed and brought into being. This study will be closely coordinated with the planning for the Visitors Center which the Congress has already authorized.

CONCLUSION

It will not be easy to achieve our goal for the Nation's Capital—a city in which all Americans can take pride. The problems to which this message is primarily directed—better government and crime—will not be solved overnight. Dedicated and persistent efforts by private citizens, private organizations, private businesses, and by the District and Federal Government will be required.

The task is difficult and success will take time. We must—and we will—succeed.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 1967.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance in the Senate tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1967, in order that I may accompany the Vice President on a trip which he is making to North Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL 11 A.M. ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, Tuesday, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Wednesday morning, March 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PASTORE AND OTHER SENATORS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, at the conclusion of the 3 hours pertaining to germaneness under the Pastore rule, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other Senators may be recognized for a series of round-robin speeches on a subject in which they are interested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am wondering how these unanimous-consent requests tie in with the desire of the majority leader with respect to the disposition of the pending military authorization bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like, as soon as possible, to reach a vote on the sense of the Congress amendments that the Senate has been notified will be offered, some of which are at the desk at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it has been my intention to call up my proposals tomorrow. I have a rather lengthy speech to make today. I do not know how many other Senators wish to speak, but I am informed that other Senators wish to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator like to have the Senate convene earlier tomorrow?

Mr. CLARK. We have a very important committee meeting tomorrow morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania be prepared to offer his amendments tomorrow?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator in a position to acquaint us now with the proposals that he expects to offer?

Mr. CLARK. They are at the desk. I explained them at some length last week. Generally speaking, they would carry out the sense of the Senate with respect to bombing in Vietnam; the number of troops we would have in Vietnam without a declaration of war; and the sense of the Senate that we would

encourage an opening of negotiations to conclude hostilities at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, in addition to the proposals to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, another proposal will be offered by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

Mr. CLARK. That is my understanding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the Senator from Pennsylvania advise us about his amendment to rule XXII?

Mr. CLARK. As soon as the Senate returns to the consideration of the reorganization bill, I shall be prepared to call up, under limited time, if that is acceptable, the five remaining amendments which have not yet been disposed of. When that will be, I do not know.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has been most cooperative. Had the opportunity offered itself last week, he would have offered his amendments at that time. But because of the circumstances, he graciously agreed to postpone calling them up until the Senate could dispose of the military authorization bill.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Montana.

REPORT OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of all expenditures, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

H.J. RES. 28

A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to request the Department of Defense to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system available with burial spaces in national cemeteries for all U.S. military service men and women who are entitled to the same and wish to be interred there

Whereas, figures, compiled by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966, show that of the 4,873 servicemen who lost their lives in the fight for freedom in Vietnam during the period, 873 or 20.4 percent were buried in national cemeteries. Although one in five were actually interred in national cemeteries, many more would probably have also been buried in a national cemetery had there been available space near the home of next of kin, and

Whereas, over the past three years there has been a determined effort on the part of some federal agencies to sharply curtail or do away altogether with any further provision for national cemeteries. The Bureau of the Budget has stated unequivocally, "We continue to believe that expansion of the national cemetery is undesirable. The Administration firmly believes that funeral benefits now paid by the Veterans Adminis-

tration and under Social Security are far preferable to the furnishing of interment facilities by the Government. Legislation to this end would not be in accord with the program of the President," and

Whereas, present-day burial expenses are sufficiently high without placing on the veteran's and serviceman's dependent the added cost of purchasing a burial plot, and

Whereas, the burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and that provided under Social Security are far too meager to provide for the last rites of most veterans and servicemen, and

Whereas, the Department of the Army has advised Congress that, "The Administration has determined that it is opposed to any further expansion of the present national cemetery system with the exception of Arlington National Cemetery," and

Whereas, it is perfectly evident that the present Administration is determined to end the national cemetery system just as soon as present facilities are exhausted. This procedure is a departure from the long-time precedent that veterans who have served their nation in time of war are entitled to burial sites provided by the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That we strongly urge the Congress of the United States to take such action as necessary to forestall the present plans of the Bureau of the Budget and the Administration, and to oppose the position of the Department of Defense which supports the Administration's policy of no further expansion of the national cemetery system, with the exception of the Arlington National Cemetery, as many national cemeteries have already exhausted available space and several others are scheduled for closing this year, and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Defense be requested to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to make national cemeteries available with burial spaces for all U.S. military service men and women who are entitled to the same, and wish to be interred there, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Charles L. Schultz, Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Honorable Mike J. Mansfield, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; the Honorable James F. Battin, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.; and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

I hereby certify that the within Joint Resolution originated in the House.

EDNA J. HINMAN,

Chief clerk.

JAMES R. FELT,

Speaker of the House.

TED JAMES,

President of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina. This concurrent resolution memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to advertise, sell and deliver

master keys and master key sets which may be used by unauthorized persons to commit larceny, burglary, and other crimes.

I ask that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks and that it be appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 191

(Adopted February 22, 1967)

A concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to advertise, sell and deliver master keys and master key sets which may be used by unauthorized persons to commit larceny, burglary and other crimes

Whereas, the General Assembly of South Carolina has become aware recently that the United States mails are being used to advertise, sell and deliver master keys and master key sets which unlock large groups of door locks, vehicle switches and other locking devices; and

Whereas, the receipt by persons within the State of originals of Exhibit "A" bears witness to this practice of using the mails; and

Whereas, the General Assembly believes that the continued commerce through the mails of advertisement for and delivery of these master keys and key sets represents a threat to the security of property throughout the Nation, and an unnecessary temptation toward crime, especially for young people. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the Congress of the United States is requested to enact legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to advertise, sell and deliver master keys and key sets without restriction, regulation and control.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to each member of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives from South Carolina.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William Matson Roth, of California, to be special representative for trade negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank;

Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon, to be a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of treaties were submitted:

By Mr. LAUSCHE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive H, 89th Congress, second ses-

sion, Exploration of the Sea Convention (Ex. Rept. No. 1);

Executive T, 89th Congress, second session, Notes Amending the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries (Ex. Rept. No. 1);

Executive U, 89th Congress, second session, International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (Ex. Rept. No. 1);

Executive Q, 89th Congress, second session, Convention of Mar del Plata on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation (Ex. Rept. No. 2);

Executive R, 89th Congress, second session, Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic (Ex. Rept. No. 2);

Executive K, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Professional Equipment (Ex. Rept. No. 3);

Executive L, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the ATA Carnet for the Temporary Admission of Goods (Ex. Rept. No. 3);

Executive M, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention Regarding ECS Carnets for Commercial Samples (Ex. Rept. No. 3);

Executive J, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on Containers (Ex. Rept. No. 3); and

Executive N, 89th Congress, second session, Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods Under Cover of TIR Carnets (Ex. Rept. No. 3).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1082. A bill to require that medicine cabinets used in federally assisted housing be equipped with latches designed to prevent young children from gaining access to the contents of such cabinets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 1083. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to permit Federal credit unions to make long-term loans secured by real estate;

S. 1084. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; and

S. 1085. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, dividend and reserve provisions; to require the establishment of an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1086. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; and

S. 1087. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle national scenic parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1088. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1089. A bill for the relief of the H & H Manufacturing Co., Inc.; and

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1091. A bill for the relief of Hyun Ok Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1092. A bill to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

CONGRATULATIONS OF THE CONGRESS TO PUERTO RICO ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MONTAYA) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 86) to extend the congratulations of the Congress to the people of Puerto Rico on their 50th anniversary of U.S. citizenship, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULES OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO REPORTING OF PERSONAL ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 87

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE —

"Reporting of personal assets and liabilities

"1. Each individual who is a Member of the Senate and each officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum on April 15 of any year shall file with the Comptroller General on or before such date—

"(a) a financial statement listing both assets and liabilities (exclusive of items of tangible personal property having a fair market value of not more than \$5,000) held by him or his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly, as of January 1 of such year; and

"(b) a copy of any income tax return filed by him with respect to the taxes imposed by subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code for the most recent taxable year ending prior to such date.

"2. Both the Comptroller General and the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the U.S. Senate are authorized to examine the reports and copies of income tax re-

turns required to be filed with them under this Section, and in any case in which such examination discloses evidence of any impropriety relating to the discharge of the official function or duties of the Member, officer, or employee filing the report or copy of return or of a violation by such Member, officer, or employee of any law of the United States, the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct or the Comptroller General shall make such further investigation with respect to such impropriety or violation as it or he deems necessary to establish the facts with respect thereto.

"3. If after such further investigation either the Comptroller General or the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is of the opinion that such impropriety or violation has occurred, it or he shall make a report thereon to the Senate and, if in its opinion or in his opinion such violation of law has occurred, to the Attorney General.

"4. As used in this Section, the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means—

"(a) Members of the Senate;

"(b) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate;

"(c) an employee of the Senate, or of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate;

"(d) the legislative counsel of the Senate or any employee of that office;

"(e) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties;

"(f) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

"(g) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate;

"(h) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; and

"(i) an employee of any Member of the Senate whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1089 TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS FOR A REPORT THEREON

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 88); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 88

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1089) entitled "A bill for the relief of the H & H Manufacturing Co., Inc.", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1090 TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS FOR A RE- PORT THEREON

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

CXIII—290—Part 4

S. RES. 89

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1090) entitled "A Bill for the relief of The O'Brien Dieselelectric Corporation", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

EQUIPMENT OF LATCHES FOR MEDICINE CABINETS TO PREVENT CHILDREN FROM GAINING ACCESS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require that medicine cabinets used in federally assisted housing be equipped with latches designed to prevent young children from gaining access to the contents of such cabinets.

This is the same bill I introduced last year, when crowded committee schedules did not permit consideration of it. I strongly urge consideration of the bill early in this Congress because the lives of literally hundreds of children may depend upon it.

In the summer of 1959 the Accident Prevention Committee of the American Public Health Association stated that accidental poisoning of children could be drastically reduced if homes were equipped with safety storage cabinets for medicines.

The committee, working with the U.S. Public Health Service, sought adoption of a plan to provide for inclusion of these cabinets during construction or remodeling of every home.

Unfortunately, the plan foundered on the rocks of bureaucracy and the number of reported cases of accidental poisonings among children has continued to grow year by year since then.

In 1965, the most recent year for which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has figures, there were about 148,000 reported cases of accidental poisonings among children under 5 years of age in this country. An estimated 400 of these cases resulted in death.

And not all of the cases of accidental poisonings are reported.

The New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association recently observed that there may have been 500,000 such cases in the Nation in 1966, and about 50,000 in my State of New Jersey alone.

In the year in which the American Public Health Association began its activity in this area, more children were victims of accidental poisoning than of diphtheria, scarlet fever, hepatitis, and polio combined.

The president of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association has been quoted as saying:

Some drug poisoning is a result of mistaken over-dosing. But a great deal of it is like any other household poisoning—the child simply swallows something he has found.

I understand that manufacturers of medicines voluntarily have agreed to bottle their products in containers with safety caps which are difficult for children to remove. This, indeed, is a commendable step.

But pharmacists recommend that we take the further step of providing a means of keeping all medicines in a locked closet out of children's reach. Most homes do not have such cabinets, although at least five companies manufacture them under a Government-owned patent which is available to all who want to use it.

There are two types of devices currently available—one for a sliding door cabinet and one for a swing door cabinet. Both were developed from a prototype invented by Dr. Elbert L. Chapman, a retired chief of the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Control, who turned the patent over to the Government.

For the swing door cabinet, there is a three-button device with the buttons spaced far enough apart so they can be controlled only by an adult hand. For the sliding door cabinet, there is a knob device with finger tabs on either side which must be squeezed together while the knob is pushed in and revolved.

The legislation I am introducing amends eight different laws and applies the same standard to family housing constructed by the Department of Defense. The agencies which administer these programs already have adopted various standards which must be met, but none of them deal with safety latches on medicine cabinets.

In order to obtain a uniform standard for all of the programs, I felt this legislation should be submitted to Congress in the form of legislation because Congress has a broader responsibility than any individual agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1082) to require that medicine cabinets used in federally assisted housing be equipped with latches designed to prevent young children from gaining access to the contents of such cabinets, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SCENIC RIVERS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], an administration bill to establish a nationwide system of scenic rivers.

This bill is similar in several respects to one which I cosponsored with Senator CHURCH in the 89th Congress, S. 1446, to establish a nationwide system of wild rivers—and which passed the Senate last year, 71 to 1. That bill has been reintroduced as S. 119.

The new bill introduced today is patterned after the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964, which established the national wilderness preservation sys-

tem. It sets out a statement of policy to the effect that our national policy of constructing dams and other works on certain sections of rivers, needs to be complemented with a policy of preserving other sections of free-flowing rivers and related adjacent lands that possess outstanding scenic, fish, wildlife, and other outdoor recreation values.

The nationwide system would include "national scenic river areas" to be designated by Congress, and State and local scenic river areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Nine rivers or their segments would make up the initial system. These would include segments of the Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, the Rogue in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, the Eleven Point in Missouri and Arkansas, the Cacapon and Shenandoah in West Virginia, the St. Croix in Wisconsin and Minnesota, and the Wolf in Wisconsin. Thirty-five other rivers would be studied for possible future inclusion.

The national scenic river areas listed in the bill do not include the Missouri in Montana or the Buffalo in Arkansas because these areas are now under consideration for administration in connection with the National Park System. They might, for example, be authorized as national scenic riverways comparable to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the letter transmitting the bill, plus an analysis of the bill as provided by the Department of the Interior, appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will conduct an open hearing on S. 119, the wild rivers bill, and on the national scenic rivers bill which I have just introduced, Thursday and Friday, April 13 and 14.

The hearings will start at 10 a.m., and will be conducted in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

Those organizations and individuals interested in presenting their views on this important legislation should notify the committee, preferably by letter, and indicate upon which of the two dates they wish to be heard.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1092) to reserve certain public lands and other lands for a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers, to provide a procedure for adding additional lands to the system, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. JACKSON are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1967.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President, in his January 30, 1967, message to the Congress on

protecting our natural heritage renewed his recommendation for legislation to establish a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers similar to legislation the Department submitted to the 89th Congress. The need to act in order to preserve portions of our free-flowing rivers for the benefit of the American people is urgent. Unless we act promptly, growth and development will soon make the beauty of the unspoiled stretches of our scenic waterways merely a memory.

While river flows have been harnessed to aid navigation, control floods, increase farm productivity and hydroelectric power, too little attention has been given to the importance of protecting the very water we drink and the values of fish and wildlife, scenic and outdoor recreation resources. These values, although often measureless in commercial terms, should be preserved by a program that will guarantee America her heritage of unspoiled, unpolluted free-flowing rivers. Our belief is shared by a wide range of public and private authorities, and the time to act is now, before it is too late.

In 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission endorsed efforts to preserve certain rivers because of unique natural values they provide. Also in 1962, the President upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, approved for application by them and by the Bureau of the Budget, a policy statement concerning the use and development of water and related land resources. This policy statement provides, among other things, that in particular instances wild areas of rivers should be maintained and used for recreational purposes.

In 1963, this Department and the Department of Agriculture initiated a coordinated, broad-scale study of the need to preserve a nationwide system of scenic or wild rivers. This study revealed that of a total of approximately 100,000 miles of rivers and tributaries in the United States averaging a flow of at least 550 cubic feet per second, only a few of the rivers could still be classified as relatively unspoiled. In a strict sense, a pristine river is a rare thing today in the United States. There are, however, many free-flowing rivers, or segments thereof, which still retain enough of their original character to provide the distinctive type of enjoyment and inspiration that increasing numbers of people are seeking. The sheer natural beauty of such river areas is a source of physical and spiritual refreshment.

The enclosed bill, which would establish a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers, is similar to the proposal which the Department submitted to the 89th Congress. We urge that it receive early consideration. A detailed analysis of its provisions is set forth in an enclosure to this report.

Pertinent data with respect to the initial nine areas included by this bill in the System is enclosed.

The proposed legislation has been prepared in collaboration with the Secretary of Agriculture and has his approval.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ANALYSIS OF BILL

The bill is patterned after the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964, (78 Stat. 890), which established the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Section 1 provides for the Act to be cited as the "Scenic Rivers Act".

Section 2 sets out a statement of policy to the effect that our national policy of constructing dams and other works on certain sections of rivers needs to be complemented

with a policy of preserving other sections of free-flowing rivers and related adjacent lands that possess outstanding scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. The section declares a congressional policy to preserve, reclaim, and appropriately develop such sections of our free-flowing rivers, and establishes a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers composed of (1) areas designated by Congress in this Act or subsequent Acts as "national scenic river areas", and (2) State and local scenic river areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the System.

Section 3 defines the term "national scenic river area" to denote those segments of streams, tributaries, or rivers that possess outstanding scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values and are essentially free-flowing and unpolluted, and that should be preserved in such condition, or restored thereto, for public use and enjoyment. The definition of "national scenic river area" is not limited to relatively unspoiled or wilderness types of rivers because there are only a few such rivers remaining in the United States. There are, however, many free-flowing rivers, or segments thereof, which still retain enough of their original character to provide the distinctive type of enjoyment and inspiration that increasing numbers of people are seeking.

Section 4(a) designates as the initial national scenic river areas nine rivers or segments thereof, some of which are already mostly in Federal ownership. Each of these rivers has been carefully studied by this Department and the Department of Agriculture, and is considered to be an outstanding example of the values a Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers seeks to preserve. The segments of the Salmon (Idaho), Clearwater (Idaho), Rogue (Oregon), Rio Grande (New Mexico), Eleven Point (Missouri and Arkansas), Cacapon (West Virginia), and Shenandoah (West Virginia) Rivers mentioned in this section were included in the bill that passed the Senate in the 89th Congress (S. 1446). The segment of the Eleven Point River, however, has been extended downstream to its confluence with the Black River—a distance of approximately 50 miles. This has been made possible by a recent decision of the Secretary of the Army to recommend deauthorization of the Water Valley Dam project on the lower portion of the Eleven Point River.

The segments of the Saint Croix (Wisconsin and Minnesota) and Wolf (Wisconsin) Rivers described in this section have also been proposed for preservation as free-flowing rivers in previous bills introduced in the 89th Congress. The Saint Croix River is widely acclaimed as one of the most scenic and relatively unpolluted large rivers in the United States. The Wolf River has long been the subject of intensive efforts to protect its recreational qualities. On January 4, 1967, the Secretary of the Interior announced that a grant had been made to the State of Wisconsin out of funds appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the State to acquire and develop the portion of the Wolf River in Langlade County for scenic river purposes. The Secretary of the Interior also announced that he planned to recommend the downstream portion of the Wolf River in Menominee County for national scenic river status.

The nine rivers designated as the initial national scenic river areas are scattered across the face of America. Three of them—the Clearwater, Salmon, and Rogue—are in the far West. Four others—the Rio Grande, Eleven Point, Saint Croix, and Wolf—are in the middle section of the country. The remaining two, the Cacapon and Shenandoah, are located in the East. These rivers contain an intriguing variety of recreational opportunity. There are whitewater rivers such as sections of the Salmon and Rogue, and more

leisurely, forested rivers such as the Saint Croix and Eleven Point. All of them afford outstanding opportunities for a wide variety of outdoor recreation experiences. Each is regarded as one of the finest examples of the remaining free-flowing rivers in this country.

The national scenic river areas listed in this section do not include the Missouri in Montana or the Buffalo in Arkansas because these areas are now under consideration for administration in connection with the National Park System. They might, for example, be authorized as National Scenic Riverways comparable to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The upper reaches of the Hudson River in New York and the Connecticut River in Vermont and New Hampshire also are not included at this time because of studies now underway.

Section 4(b) provides for the administration of the Rio Grande, Saint Croix, and Wolf National Scenic River Areas by the Secretary of the Interior, and for the administration of the Clearwater and Eleven Point National Scenic River Areas by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Salmon, Rogue, Cacaon, and Shenandoah National Scenic River Areas are to be administered in a manner agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President. The rivers to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture are closely associated with national forests.

Section 4(b) also requires that detailed boundaries for each national scenic river area be established as soon as practicable after the enactment of the bill, and provides that such boundaries may not include on both sides of the river a total of more than 320 acres per mile. This provision will enable the amount of land included in a national scenic river area to vary in width at different points along the river segment. Some portions of a national scenic river area will extend only a short distance beyond the riverbanks. Other portions will include a wider strip of land along the river that will vary in width depending upon such factors as the terrain, vegetative cover, existing developments, and the need for public use facilities and administrative sites. This provision envisions that the boundaries of a national scenic river area generally will not extend to a width of more than 1,320 feet from either side of the river.

Sections 4(c) and (d) set forth the general authority of each Secretary to acquire property within the boundaries of national scenic river areas, but restrict each Secretary's authority to acquire a fee title on both sides of the river to a total of not more than 100 acres per mile. This envisions the fee acquisition of a strip of land generally not more than 400 feet from either side of the river. This limitation does not apply, however, where additional lands need to be acquired in fee to provide public use facilities and public access, and to avoid the payment of severance costs. The bill contemplates that the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land will be adequate to protect the remaining lands included in the boundaries of a national scenic river area.

Sections 4(c), (e), and (f) provide that the appropriate Secretary may not acquire (1) lands owned by a State without its consent; (2) lands owned by an Indian tribe without the consent of the tribal governing body; (3) lands within an incorporated city, village, or borough by condemnation proceedings as long as satisfactory zoning ordinances are in effect with respect to such lands; and (4) county-owned lands by any method, without the consent of the county, as long as it is following a satisfactory management plan for such lands.

Section 5(a) sets forth the purposes for which the national scenic river areas are to be administered. It directs the two Secretaries to give primary management emphasis to protecting the aesthetic and scenic features of such areas. This section recognizes that management plans for national

scenic river areas may vary, depending upon the special attributes of each such area. The intention of this section is to maintain the status quo with respect to the character of the river and related adjacent lands at the time of its designation as a national scenic river area. It is recognized, however, that additional highways may unavoidably be routed across national scenic river areas.

Section 5(b) provides that the States will be encouraged to cooperate in the administration of a national scenic river area where it includes State-owned or county-owned lands. This section also authorizes the transfer of any Federal land located within a national scenic river area, with the consent of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, to the appropriate Secretary for administration as part of the national scenic river area.

Section 6(a) restricts the authority of the Federal Power Commission to license the building of any new dam or any project work unrelated to an existing project within a segment of a river designated as a national scenic river area. It provides that the Federal Power Commission may not issue such licenses unless the Congress enacts legislation approving their issuance. The purposes of designating an area as a national scenic river area are to maintain the free-flowing character of the stream and the natural character of the related adjacent lands. The building of dams or other structures would destroy these conditions.

Section 6(b) expressly continues the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws to the areas designated as national scenic river areas. All mining operations, however, will be subject to regulations needed to safeguard the national scenic river values. In addition, after the effective date of this Act, a mining claim perfected within a national scenic river area will give the mining claimant title only to the mineral deposits in the claim, together with the right to make any use of the land surface of such a claim as is reasonably required for his mining operations.

We believe that mineral activity within a national scenic river area should not be precluded, but that it should be subject to sufficient controls to prevent mining from defeating the purposes of this bill. This section provides such controls.

Sections 6(c) and (d) provide that when a portion of a national scenic river area is also located within the National Wilderness Preservation System, the National Park System, or the National Wildlife Refuge System, the provisions of this bill and the Act or Acts governing the respective system will apply to such area, and if there should be a conflict the more restrictive provisions will apply.

The provisions of the Wilderness Act governing mining in the national forest areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas are, for example, more restrictive than the comparable provisions of this bill. When a portion of a scenic river area, therefore, is also within a portion of a national forest designated by the Wilderness Act as a wilderness area, it would be withdrawn on January 1, 1984, from further appropriation under the mining laws and from further disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral leasing.

Section 6(e) requires the Federal or State agency which has responsibility for a national scenic river area to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior and with appropriate State water pollution control agencies for the purpose of controlling the pollution of waters in such area.

The maintenance of a high-quality water yield in a scenic river area is affected by upstream developments. This section requires the appropriate Federal and State officials to take action to control upstream pollution under their existing authority.

Section 6(f) preserves the status quo with respect to the law of water rights, and makes

clear that the designation of a stream or portion thereof as a national scenic river area is not to be considered a reservation of waters for purposes other than those specified in the bill, or in quantities greater than necessary to accomplish these purposes.

Section 6(g) preserves the jurisdiction which the States have over fish and wildlife.

Section 7 establishes the procedures for other areas to be designated as national scenic river areas by subsequent legislation. As a basis for subsequent legislation, this section provides for studies and the development of detailed information and for the submission of reports and recommendations to the Congress on potential national scenic river areas in three ways:

(1) It directs the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, to consult with other Federal agencies and with the States in which the 35 rivers named in the section are located for joint Federal-State plans to preserve them, and to submit recommendations to the President, who in turn will submit recommendations to the Congress with respect to their designation as national scenic river areas. The section requires that one-half of the 35 rivers be studied within five years after enactment of the bill, and the balance within ten years. The 35 rivers have been the subject of preliminary investigation and have been identified as prime candidates for national scenic river status.

(2) It requires all river basin and project planning reports submitted to the Congress to discuss the alternative use of a river or portion thereof as a national scenic river area, and to reconsider specifically for this purpose any river segment designated by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) It requires the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, to submit from time to time to the President, and for the President to submit to the Congress, recommendations for additional national scenic river areas.

Section 8 provides that a national scenic river area added to the System by subsequent legislation will be administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, depending on the location of the area and its relation to the other programs of the two departments.

Section 9 directs the Secretary of the Interior to encourage the States to consider needs and opportunities for establishing State and local scenic river areas in the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans and project proposals submitted to the Secretary under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897). Upon the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of scenic river area projects proposed by the States for financial assistance under the Fund Act, funds would be available for the acquisition and development of such scenic river areas from the monies allocated to the States out of the Fund. This section also directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, under the authorities vested in them, to assist, advise, and cooperate with States, local agencies, and private interests in the establishment of such scenic river areas. The Secretary of the Interior may designate a State or local scenic river area as part of the Nationwide System of Scenic Rivers if the State or local agency administering the area agrees to manage and protect it in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

Section 10 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Cost data for the nine areas designated as national scenic river areas in this bill are presently being developed. Precise cost estimates for land acquisition and development will not be available until surveys are made

on the ground to establish the detailed boundaries of the proposed areas. At the present time we estimate that approximately \$3.5 million will be needed per year over a ten-year period for acquisition of property for the nine areas initially designated as national scenic river areas in this bill.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

The time has come to study our increasing fire problem on a nationwide basis. There can be no doubt that something should and must be done about it.

The recent terrible fire with such tragic loss of life in Montgomery of my own State of Alabama reaffirms the urgency of this need. That sad occasion followed in relatively close succession to the burning of the McCormick Place in Chicago which is said to be the most devastating fire since the 1906 San Francisco fire.

In spite of our great progress as a Nation in most all lines of human endeavor, we still have unwarranted and excessive losses of lives and property by fire. As the President pointed out in his message to Congress on February 16, 1967, our loss in lives, which in the year 1965 was 12,000, is about four times greater on a per capita basis than that of the United Kingdom, and is over six times as great as that of Japan. Needless to say, our property loss each year amounts to billions of dollars. Immediate steps should be taken to see just how and why the United States is so sadly lacking in this regard.

In the field of housing and urban development, it is my belief that a wholesome and productive reexamination of construction, in both design and materials, can be made. Better attention could be given in urban development to the crucial place which fire prevention and control should have in the balanced and proper development of a community. In the field of urban development alone, I am mindful of the fact that at this very moment there are thousands of slum or blighted homes and buildings throughout the Nation boarded up and lying vacant as fire hazards. Due consideration may or may not have been given in these various projects to the extra burdens these vacancies place on the local fire and police departments and also to the time involved and the manner in which this vacant and fire hazardous period endangers the surrounding areas. This is but one of many examples that could be given of the need for a coordinated study of the fire problem, not only from the standpoint of the adequacy of local fire departments, but from the standpoint of Federal and State Governments, as well. This is indeed a national problem.

Experiences and outstanding advances in one part of the country should be made known to other parts of the country. Additional training facilities and improved techniques are needed throughout the country. Every effort should be

made not only to provide our fireman with the means to put out fires, but also to diminish the grave risks to his life and limb. Definite and sound attention should be given to safety principles in construction and to the due inspection and rehabilitation of existing structures with fire safety standards in mind.

It seems logical that an appropriate way to approach this comprehensive subject is by a national Commission which shall make a thorough and unbiased study and report to the Congress and to the President.

Accordingly, my resolution would provide for such a Commission of 20 competent and outstanding members to be appointed by the President and empowered to go into the question fully and in depth.

There must be a starting place for something this comprehensive, and I believe that the large programs which are underway in the fields of housing, community facilities, city planning, land development, rehabilitation, urban renewal, and demonstration or model cities afford a logical starting basis. Accordingly, the resolution empowers the Commission to analyze these programs and consider ways of strengthening them by legislation or otherwise to help meet the national fire problem.

The Commission, however, would have broader powers that would extend into other fields and there are several committees in Congress other than Banking and Currency that would have an interest in these. The Commission should study technological advances and how best to make them available to prevent and combat fire. It should study municipal problems of recruiting and training firemen, and of the ways in which a better level of public education and enlightenment on this subject can best be achieved.

The time is appropriate for a thorough assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing our extensive and unnecessary losses by fire.

While the kind of comprehensive study which this Commission would be authorized to undertake by my bill is long overdue, the Commission's study must not be used as a basis for deterring immediate action in those areas where we are prepared and ready to move ahead. In the event the committee finds that we are ready to move now I feel sure that the appropriate authority will be recommended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONGRATULATIONS OF THE CONGRESS TO PUERTO RICO ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on next Thursday, March 2, the people of

Puerto Rico will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the grant of American citizenship to them by the 64th Congress in 1917. It is highly appropriate that this 90th Congress should give formal recognition to this historic occasion, and accordingly, on behalf of myself, and Senators KUCHEL, BURDICK, JAVITS, and MONROYA, I send to the desk a resolution for that purpose.

Mr. President, every American everywhere can be proud of the truly great progress and attainments that have been made in Puerto Rico during the past half century of American citizenship. It will be recalled that Puerto Rico came under the American flag as a result of our war with Spain. American troops had landed in force on the island as a part of our military action in the Caribbean. Puerto Rico—then known as "Porto Rico"—was formally ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris, the second paragraph of article IX of which provided that the Congress should determine—"the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of the areas ceded.

The act of March 2, 1917, known as the Jones Act, was a cornerstone in the fulfillment of that obligation by the Congress.

It not only granted full American citizenship to all of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico who wished it, but it also provided a bill of rights and established a civil government with very substantial powers of local self-government.

Still another legislative milestone was passed in 1948 with the enactment of the elective governor bill, and then in 1950 the 81st Congress approved Public Law 600 which was the foundation of the present Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It will be recalled that the constitution of the Commonwealth was approved on July 3, 1952, by the 82d Congress.

Mr. President, the history of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico and the present state of economic and political attainment of the people of Puerto Rico bear eloquent witness to the wisdom and statesmanship of the Members of the 64th Congress in enacting the Jones Act extending American citizenship to Puerto Rico. I urge this Congress promptly to give formal recognition to the 50th anniversary of that occasion by adopting my resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. RES. 86

Whereas the Jones Act of March 2, 1917, granted United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas March 2, 1967 marks the fiftieth anniversary of this historic event; and

Whereas the bond of common citizenship has played a major role in the development of close and mutually beneficial economic, cultural, political and legal relationships between the United States and Puerto Rico; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the Congress hereby extends to the people of Puerto Rico its congratulations on their fiftieth anniversary of United States citizenship.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 889, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of February 7, 1967:

S. 876. A bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education: Mr. BURDICK, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PROXMIER, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. TYDINGS.

Authority of February 8, 1967:

S. 928. A bill to protect the right of privacy by prohibiting wire interception and eavesdropping, and for other purposes: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

S. 929. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff classification of braided rugs composed of tubular braids with a core: Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. TALMADGE.

Authority of February 15, 1967:

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to restore Federal aid to highways: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of February 16, 1967:

S. 990. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes: Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PELL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S. 1006. A bill to provide for the control and prevention of erosion damages to the roadbeds and rights-of-way of existing State, county, and other rural roads and highways, and for other purposes: Mr. LONG of Missouri.

ANTIPOVERTY WHITEWASH

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Antipoverty Whitewash," written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in their column entitled "Inside Report," published in the Washington Post of recent date.

There being no objection, the column

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1967]

ANTIPOVERTY WHITEWASH

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

For all of Majority Leader Mike Mansfield's bold talk about congressional scrutiny of Great Society programs, the Senate's prospective investigation of the antipoverty program is taking on unmistakable signs of whitewash.

The Senate is expected soon to appropriate \$165,000 for a Senate Labor Committee study of President Johnson's war against poverty, an amount wholly inadequate for serious investigation. More important, a secret bipartisan agreement provides that only one-third of that money may be used to hire outside consultants.

Thus, the investigating will be almost entirely in the hands of the Labor Committee's Democratic-controlled staff, with help from individual consultants only on a piecemeal basis. And since this staff can scarcely be wholly objective about the most politically vulnerable program of a Democratic Administration, suspicions of whitewash are justified.

The story is another sign of congressional impotence. But it also reveals just how sensitive the Johnson Administration really is about any hard-nosed probe of the war on poverty.

As recently as last December, a non-nonsense investigation by the Senate Labor Subcommittee handling poverty matters seemed possible. During the congressional recess, the Subcommittee Chairman, Sen. Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, and staffers traveled to New York City for private conferences with Ford Foundation officials to discuss outside consultants for the study.

The result was a proposed \$252,000 budget, adequate but scarcely bountiful. Preliminary plans called for 12 separate studies of poverty programs to be conducted by outside experts—some from management consultant firms, some from Space Age industries, some from the academic community.

These plans immediately aroused deep concern inside the Administration—and particularly in Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). After all, if tough-minded management consultants were called in, they might undermine the poverty crusade's main philosophical pillar: participation of the poor in fighting poverty.

These were the very risks foreseen by Senate Democrats. It soon became clear that the need for outside management consultants was felt by only one Democrat, Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, on the Clark Subcommittee. The three Republicans—Jacob Javits of New York, Winston Prouty of Vermont and George Murphy of California—dissented from this majority Democratic position.

The partisan split widened late in January when the Labor Committee's Democrats held a secret caucus. Alabama's Sen. Lister Hill, Chairman of the full Committee, asserted that outside consultants might badly hurt the poverty program. Sen. Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy of Massachusetts agreed. The overwhelming majority of Democrats agreed that their own hired hands should run the study contending management consultants would not appreciate the political and social subtleties.

Thus, when the full Labor Committee met soon thereafter, the Democrats slashed the original \$250,000 budget to \$190,000.

Chairman Clark later worked out a private compromise with the Republicans allocating one-third of the total funds to hiring outside consultants. But that total soon dwindled to insignificant proportions. The Senate Rules Committee, which passes on fund requests of all other committees, further sliced the \$190,000 to \$165,000. None of the Labor Committee Democrats complained very loudly.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER, EMPLOYMENT, AND POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I announce today that the Senate Labor Committee's examination of the war on poverty will begin with 4 days of hearings in Washington on March 13, 15, 16, and 17. The Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which I chair, will follow these hearings with extensive hearings in each of the seven geographical regions through which antipoverty program activities are administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In its March Washington hearings the subcommittee will hear testimony from representatives of State and local government agencies, from a panel of local community action agency directors, from a panel of representatives of the poor, and from business, labor, and academic leaders, who are familiar with the Federal Government's antipoverty program.

While the exact schedule and locations of the subcommittee's field hearings have not yet been determined, hearings will be held during the months of April and May in each of the seven economic opportunity regions, thus covering all areas of the country.

I would also like to answer charges recently made in a syndicated column that my subcommittee's investigation of the war on poverty will be a "whitewash."

Based, as it is, upon misstatements of fact and misrepresentations of the views of both Democratic and Republican members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the charge of a prospective "whitewash" is totally unfounded. Lest the aims and purposes of my proposed inquiry be misconstrued by newspaper readers, I would like to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

As I have stated on numerous occasions in the past, publicly, as well as privately to my colleagues in the Congress and to persons in the Johnson administration including Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I approach this investigation with a completely open mind. Neither I nor the other members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of either party have any preconceived notions about the future directions of the war on poverty, the future role of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the successes or failures of Federal antipoverty programs, or the findings, recommendations, and conclusions that will result from the inquiry.

This inquiry will not be an attempt to sweep problems under the rug. Nor is it designed as a partisan exposé that some would like to see.

This investigation will be an objective, thorough, and bipartisan analysis of both the successes and shortcomings of the war on poverty and the administration of Economic Opportunity Act programs at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Our task is to examine and evaluate, and that evaluation will culminate in constructive criticism of past performance and constructive recommendations for future action.

**ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK, BEFORE AMERICANS
FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.**

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a splendid address made in Philadelphia last Friday by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] on the subject "Youth," and a news account of the meeting, which was a most successful one.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
DINNER, AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
PHILADELPHIA, PA., FEBRUARY 24, 1967

John Adams found the meaning of America in the scope it gave for the opportunity to excel—which, he said, "next to self-preservation, is ever the great spring of human action". Americans for Democratic Action is a young organization, on the scale of history. But in its passion for excellence, it is as old as the impulse which gave this nation birth. Therefore to be invited to speak before you is an invitation to share that passion, to discuss excellence in our day, to measure ourselves against the highest standards of truth and idealism.

Those standards are found in the thought and action of men through thousands of years in nations all over the globe. But here in America today, perhaps the clearest mirror of our performance, the truest measure of whether we live up to our ideals, is our youth. And therefore I would speak to you tonight about the rising generation in America; about the brightest, best-educated, most highly-motivated generation of young people we have had since the founding of the Republic—when the 32-year-old Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, Henry Knox built an artillery corps at 26, Alexander Hamilton joined the independence fight at 19, and Rutledge and Lynch signed the Declaration for South Carolina at 27. In the Peace Corps, in the Northern Student Movement, in Appalachia and Oakland, on dusty roads in Mississippi and narrow trails of the Andes, this generation of young people have shown an idealism and a devotion to country matched in few nations—and excelled in none.

And we have shown our admiration for them in the sincere flattery of imitation, in ways large and small. Cafe society and country clubbers follow their fashions in hair-styles and skirt lengths, listen to their music and dance their dances. The great automobile industry of Detroit styles its cars and designs their engines on the model of those built by teen-age "hot-rodders" of a few years ago. The sit-in movement which energized the Negro of the South, and resulted in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, began with a few college students. And it was a small group of Northern students, in the Mississippi Summer Project, who taught thousands of adults how to make personal witness for civil rights in conditions of difficulty and danger.

Yet for all the inspiration, all the freshness and imagination our young people have given us in the last few years, we are now profoundly troubled by them; and so we should be. For the gap between generations, always present in the past, is suddenly widening; the old bridges which span it are falling; we see all around us a terrible alienation of the best and bravest of our young; and the very shape of a generation seems turned on its head overnight. Bob Moses is gone, Stokely Carmichael stands in his place—and beyond him are others more militant, offering dark visions of an apocalyptic future. Peace Corps recruiting is not so easy as it was; and we read less of tutoring programs in the ghetto than of trips, festivals, and

drugs with strange new names. There are riots on the Los Angeles "strip", and in dozens of colleges; hundreds of young men dodge the draft in Canada, and unknown numbers effectively do the same in years of graduate study; the suicide rate among young people is rising—and so is the rate of juvenile delinquency. The troubador of their generation, who three years ago sang of the changes that were "Blowin' in the Wind", now dismisses our pronouncements as "propaganda, all is phony".

Clearly, these are different phenomena, different youth. But taken together, they mean that more and more of our children are estranged, alienated in the literal sense, almost unreachable by the familiar premises and arguments of our adult world. And the task of leadership, the first task of concerned people, is not to condemn or castigate or deplore—it is to search out the reason for disillusionment and alienation, the rationale of protest and dissent—perhaps, indeed, to learn from it. And we will learn most, I think, from the minority who most sharply articulate their criticism of our ways. And we may find that we learn most of all from those political and social dissenters whose differences with us are most grave; for among the young as among adults, the sharpest criticism often goes hand in hand with the deepest idealism and love of country.

What, then, estranges these young people, our children; what are they dissenting from—and what do they tell us about ourselves?

They begin, of course, with the war in Viet Nam. At the outset, let me emphasize again that we are not talking about all our young people; after all, Viet Nam is a young man's war. The men who fight and die there, with bravery and endurance equal to any in our history, are young. There are others, as I have seen on many campuses, who are in favor of escalation—though many who favor escalation also favor continuation of the student deferment, their seeming slogan "Escalation without Participation," or at any rate "Without Me." But when a hundred student body Presidents and editors of college newspapers; hundreds of former Peace Corps Volunteers; dozens of present Rhodes scholars—when these, the flower of our youth, question the basic premises of the war, they should not and cannot be ignored. Among these protesters, most will serve, if called upon, with courage and responsibility equal to any. But their basic loyalty and devotion does not and cannot obscure the fact of dissent.

These students oppose the war for the same reason that many of you feel anguish: for the brutality and the horror of all wars, and for the particular terror of this one. But for our young people, I suspect, Viet Nam is a shock as it cannot be to us. They did not know World War II, or even Korea. And this is a war surrounded by rhetoric they do not understand or accept; these are the children not of the Cold War, but of the Thaw. Their memories of Communism are not of Stalin's purges and death camps, not even the terrible revelations of the Twentieth Party Congress, or the streets of Hungary. They see the world as one in which Communist states can be each others' deadliest enemies or even friends of the West, in which Communism is certainly no better, but perhaps no worse, than many other evil and repressive dictatorships all around the world—with which we conclude alliances when that is felt to be in our interest.

And even as the declared foreign policy of our government is to "build bridges" to this new Communist world, they see us, in the name of anti-communism, devastating the land of those we call our friends. However the war may seem to us, they see it as one in which the largest and most powerful nation on earth is killing children (they do not care if accidentally) in a remote and insignificant land. We speak of past commitments, of the burden of past mistakes; and they ask why they should now atone for mis-

takes made before many of them were born, before almost any could vote. They see us spend billions on armaments while poverty and ignorance continue at home; they see us willing to fight a war for freedom in Viet Nam, but unwilling to fight with one-hundredth the money or force or effort to secure freedom in Mississippi or Alabama or the ghettos of the North. And they see, perhaps most disturbing of all, that they are remote from the decisions of policy; that they themselves frequently do not, by the nature of our political system, share in the power of choice on great questions which shape their lives.

These, at any rate, are some of the sources of their dissent from the war. It is not difficult to understand them.

It would be tempting—but it would be wrong and self-deluding—to trace to the war all the problems of our disaffected youth. Nor can this problem be traced to any individual, or to any Administration, or to a political party; the challenge is deeper and broader.

Consider for example our economy: the wondrous production machine which has made us richer, as we count, than any people in history, within which we all find sustenance and support. It is a business economy—which is to say, that most Americans are engaged in some form of business—indeed, that Coolidge was accurate, if not particularly edifying, when he said that "the business of America is business". Yet we know that in a survey last year, only 12 percent of all graduating college seniors hoped for a career in business, or thought such a career would be worthwhile and satisfying.

Why? Part of the answer, surely, is that the great corporations which are so large a part of American life, play so small a role in the solution of its vital problems. Civil rights, poverty, unemployment, health, education—these are but a few of the deep crises in which business participation, with a few important exceptions, has been far less than might be expected from such an important part of the society. We can recognize, and applaud, the work of the NAM in job training, or the work of Foundations like Ford and Rockefeller, or the efforts of individuals like Paul Hoffman or Thomas Watson, or corporations like Smith, Kline & French. But certainly business as a whole has not sought out the challenge of the nation's frontier. Of course, it may well be argued that the business of business is to make a profit, that to attempt more is to do less than its stockholders deserve. But does such an argument have relevance, ask the young, when a single company, like General Motors or IT&T, has annual profits greater than the gross national product of any one of seventy nations in the world?

Nor—painful as it may be for liberals to acknowledge—are these young people enchanted with liberal institutions. Most of us at this dinner, when we think of labor unions, have as a frame of reference the long struggle to establish labor's basic rights—to make the workingman something more than an industrial serf. Labor has been in the forefront of many a great battle; it has always been a major part of this organization. But youth looks with other eyes, and their view is very different: They think of labor as grown sleek and bureaucratic with power, sometimes frankly discriminatory, occasionally even corrupt and exploitative; a force not for change but for the status quo, unwilling or unable to organize new groups of members, indifferent to the men who once worked the coal mines of Appalachia, a late-comer to the struggles of the grape pickers of California or the farm laborers of the Mississippi Delta. This is a one-sided picture, without the dimensions of fifty years struggle, and the undramatic yet vital work of labor in many parts of the nation today. But there is too much truth in it for us not

to understand our children's view—or to ignore the need for change.

And we here are friends of education, all, especially of universities; our friends and allies teach there, they are a major force in the liberal community. But listen:

"Education (is) by its very nature an individual matter . . . not geared to mass production. It does not produce people who instinctively go the same way . . . (Yet) our millions learn the same lessons and spend hours before television sets looking at exactly the same thing at exactly the same time. For one reason and another we are more and more ignoring differences, if not trying to obliterate them. We seem headed toward a standardization of the mind, what Goethe called 'The deadly commonplace that fetters us all.' That might well have been, but it was not, a speaker at a Berkeley rally; it was Edith Hamilton, one of our greatest classicists. And now listen to a student representative, speaking to a meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of California:

"We have asked to be heard, you have refused. We have asked for justice. You have called it anarchy. We have asked for freedom. You have called it license. Rather than face the fear and hopelessness you have created, you have called it communistic. You have accused us of failing to use legitimate channels. But you have closed those channels to us. You, and not us, have built a university based on distrust and dishonesty."

It is impossible to mistake the anguish of that voice. There may be many things in that cry, but one of them is surely a protest of individuality—against the university as corporate bureaucracy, against the dull sameness Miss Hamilton saw also—for in bureaucracy and sameness is the denial of individuality, and the denial that human beings matter; if all are the same, why listen to what anyone says? And if we are not prepared to listen, then men cannot be recognized as more than numbers in statistical collections, a part of the gross national product like so many coffee cups or carpet sweepers.

The non-recognition of individuality—the sense that no one is listening—is even more pronounced in our politics. Television, newspapers, magazines, are a cascade of words, official statements, policies, explanations, and declarations; all flow from the height of government, down to the passive citizen; the young must feel, in their efforts to speak back, like solitary salmon trying to breast Grand Coulee dam. The words which submerge us, all too often, speak the language of a day irrelevant to our young. And the language of politics is too often insincerity—which we have perhaps too easily accepted, but to the young is particularly offensive. George Orwell wrote a generation ago that "In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible. Things like the continuation of British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, the dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aims of political parties. Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness."

There is too much truth for comfort in that statement today. And if we add to the insincerity, and the absence of dialogue, the absurdity of a politics in which a Byron de la Beckwith can declare as a candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi, we can understand why so many of our young people have turned from engagement to disengagement, from politics to passivity, from hope to nihilism, from SDS to LSD.

But it is not enough to understand, or to see clearly. Whatever their differences with us, whatever the depth of their dissent, it is

vital—for us as much as for them—that our young feel that change is possible; that they will be heard; that the cruelties and follies and injustices of the world will yield, however grudgingly, to the sweat and sacrifice they are so ready to give. If we cannot help open to them this sense of possibility, we will have only ourselves to blame for the disillusionment that will surely come. And more than disillusionment, danger; for we rely on these young people more than we know: not just in the Peace Corps, though the Peace Corps has done more for our position around the world than all our armed forces and foreign aid; not just in Civil Rights, though our youth have done more toward a solution of that problem than all the power and panoply of government; we rely on our youth for all our hopes of a better future—and thus, in a real and direct sense, for the very meaning of our own lives. If we would look back with pride at the lives we lead, we know above all that we will judge ourselves by the hope and direction we have left behind.

And to help achieve the vital sense of possibility, to take up the challenge our young pose to us, there is no group more suited than the ADA—than those who are here tonight.

For you have also been capable of scathing and turbulent dissent. You remind us that idealism and morality in politics is not only a thing of the future—and need not be a thing of the past. You remind us of how much we owe to the generation of idealist dissenters before us—and how difficult it must be for the young dissenters of today, to have before them for example only the beat and silent generation of the 1950's.

This group, if any, can reach across the gap—can reach out to the young of the '60's. And this group must. We may find some of their ideas impractical, some of their views overdrawn. But there is no question of their energy, of their ability, above all of their honest commitment to a better and more decent world for all of us. They have struggled and sacrificed alone too long. It is for us now to make the effort—to take their causes as our causes, and to enlist them in our own; to lend to their vision and daring the insight and wisdom of our experience; and to recapture for ourselves the sense of open possibility which they gave a nation for a few brief years. And if, when we reach out to them, we are tempted to dismiss their vision as impossible, or their indignation as naive, let us remember, as the poet says, that

"None can usurp the height

But those to whom the miseries of the world Are misery, and will not let them rest."

The ADA has scaled the height before. I believe it can and will again.

UNITED STATES MUST NOT IGNORE YOUTH,

ROBERT KENNEDY TELLS ADA

(By Joseph F. Lowry)

U.S. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy said here last night that America's youth see the Vietnam war as one in which "the largest and most powerful nation on earth is killing children—they do not care if accidentally—in a remote and insignificant land."

The New York senator addressed the 20th annual Roosevelt Day dinner of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action in the Bellevue-Stratford. He said the United States cannot afford to ignore youth's questioning of the war, adding:

"Even as the declared foreign policy of our government is to build bridges to this new Communist world, they (American youth) see us, in the name of anti-Communism, devastating the land of those we call our friends.

SPEAKS FOR YOUTH

"We speak of past commitments, of the burden of past mistakes; and they ask why they should now atone for mistakes made

before many of them were even born, before almost any could vote.

"They see us spend billions on armaments while poverty and ignorance continue at home. They see us willing to fight a war for freedom in Vietnam but unwilling to fight with one-hundredth the money or force or effort to secure freedom in Mississippi or Alabama or the ghettos of the North.

"And they see, perhaps most disturbing of all, that they are remote from the decision of the policy; that they themselves frequently do not, by the nature of our political system, share in the power of choice on great questions which shape their lives."

Kennedy said it is not difficult to understand their dissent from the war.

"These students," he continued, "oppose the war for the same reason that many of you feel anguish for the brutality and the horror of all wars and for the particular terror of this one.

"But for our young people, I suspect, Vietnam is a shock it cannot be to us. They did not know World War II or even Korea. And this is a war surrounded by rhetoric they do not understand or accept. These are the children, not of the cold war, but of the thaw.

"Their memories of communism are not of Stalin's purges and death camps, not even the terrible revelations of the twentieth century congress or the streets of Hungary.

"They see the world as one in which Communist states can be each other's deadliest enemies or even friends of the West in which communism is certainly no better, but perhaps no worse, than many other evil and repressive dictatorships all around the world with which we conclude alliances when that is felt to be in our interest."

Kennedy said American business, labor, education and liberals play too small a role in the solution of youths' problems. Then, he criticized U.S. policies, saying:

"The non-recognition of individuality—the sense that no one is listening—is even more pronounced in our politics.

"Television, newspapers, magazines are a cascade of words, official statements, policies, explanations and declarations. All flow from the height of government, down to the passive citizen.

"The young must feel in their efforts to speak back like solitary salmon trying to breast Grand Coulee dam. The words which submerge us all too often speak the language of a day irrelevant to our young. And the language of politics is too often insincerity, which we have perhaps too easily accepted, but to the young is particularly offensive."

AUDIENCE OF 1,800

The senator was applauded by the audience of 1,800 when he said:

"If we add to the insincerity and the absence of dialogue the absurdity of a politics in which a Byron de la Beckwith can declare as a candidate for lieutenant governor of Mississippi, we can understand why so many of our young people have turned from engagement to disengagement, from politics to passivity, from hope to nihilism, from SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) to LSD."

He said the Peace Corps has done more for the American position around the world than all our armed forces and foreign aid. He credited the nation's young for this.

He also praised youth for "doing more for civil rights than all the power and panoply of government."

Kennedy congratulated ADA for its achievements, then called on the organization "to take up the challenge our young pose for us." He said there is no group more suited for this than the ADA.

EVENT RECALLED

The senator spoke from the same podium in the same ballroom where his brother, the late President John F. Kennedy, addressed the ADA in 1959.

This was recalled among other events in the history of ADA here during a 20-minute showing of slides on a screen on the stage. The commentary was by Mrs. Emily Sunstein, chairman of the organization.

Philadelphia's U.S. Sen. Joseph S. Clark introduced Kennedy but, before he did, he charged the U.S. has placed itself in a position in Viet Nam it cannot justify morally.

He called for the end of the bombing of North Viet Nam and a limit of 500,000 on our servicemen there unless Congress declares war.

Kennedy later kidded Clark, calling him "the conscience of the Senate."

Directing his remarks to U.S. Rep. William J. Green, 3d, of this city, Kennedy said: "I'm wondering how your father (the late congressman and former Democratic city chairman) would feel if he knew you were here." Then, Kennedy drew a laugh by adding quickly: "And I'm wondering how my father would feel if he knew I was here."

CHIDES HUMPHREY

Kennedy, who is not a member of ADA and admits he doesn't agree with all they advocate, said (with a wink) he was talking to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey before going to the dinner and that Humphrey said his speaking before the ADA was like putting a chicken in a fox house.

Henry W. Sawyer, 3d, former ADA chairman, joined the kidding. He assured the audience ADA was not benefiting from CIA subsidies. He also congratulated Mayor Tate for "attending your second annual ADA dinner," then said Tate was going to give every man in the room a pension.

BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Blueprint for Peace"—Scholar-Diplomat Proposes Policy for United States," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, February 5, 1967. The article was written by Richard N. Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Institutions. This is a splendid article, and I highly commend it to Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 5, 1967]

TEN-POINT PROGRAM: "BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE"—SCHOLAR-DIPLOMAT PROPOSES POLICY FOR UNITED STATES

(By Richard N. Gardner)

To seek the best thinking of the American people on how to pursue world peace, the President of the United States, as part of this country's participation in International Cooperation Year (1965), called a White House Conference on International Cooperation Nov. 29 through Dec. 1, 1965. Nothing quite like it had ever happened before. Some 5000 people representing all aspects of American society attended. Thirty committees, including leading authorities in many fields, made more than 400 recommendations on subjects ranging from arms control to youth activities. And 220 private organizations presented statements on their activities in the field of international cooperation. The conference was, in President Johnson's words, "a town meeting of the leaders of this Nation."

What has been done to carry out the conference's recommendations? What can be done, in view of the escalating conflict in Vietnam?

The State Department recently prepared an inventory of the status of the conference

committees' more than 400 recommendations for government action. It revealed:

33 recommendations already implemented.

143 recommendations "in the process of implementation."

24 recommendations "scheduled to be implemented."

209 recommendations "under study."

26 recommendations "considered impractical at this time and perhaps at any time."

This "box score," of course, hardly provides an adequate measure of the impact of the reports on government policy. The Government might have done many of these things anyway. Some of the recommendations made by the committees were undoubtedly stimulated by government officials.

Yet even in such cases the committees served a useful function. The expression of public support for controversial proposals that had not yet achieved the status of government policy may have helped, in some cases, to move the Government forward.

NEED FOR STIMULUS

If the conference had a stimulating effect on government policy, that is all to the good. But the momentum needs to be maintained.

What of the 209 recommendations "under study" and the 26 that are considered "impractical"? Some of these recommendations undoubtedly should not be acted upon. But without further stimulus, some meritorious proposals may not receive the attention that they deserve. Therefore the question arises: How should the conference be followed up?

Fortunately, the President has appointed a Special White House Committee to study fully each recommendation that has not yet been put into effect. The President's budget and legislative proposals for this year in areas covered by the conference will be formulated on the basis of the committee's review and evaluation. The composition of the committee is impressive: Budget Director Charles Schultze, Special Assistant to the President Walt W. Rostow and Joseph A. Califano, Jr., and Raymond D. Nasher, who served as executive director of the conference. Nasher will serve as the contact for conference participants who may wish to express views to the White House Committee on any aspect of its work.

The White House Conference created, or at least strengthened, new and interested constituencies in 30 different fields of activity. Many of the individuals involved gained a new insight and a new sense of commitment as a result of sustained analysis of the subject matter in cooperation with their government counterparts. There is reason to hope that this new expertise and enthusiasm will not be dissipated.

AGENDA OUTLINED

What are the main areas of cooperation that deserve attention from the White House Committee? Here is an outline of my own agenda for cooperation, in some respects differing from on going beyond the proposals presented to the White House Conference:

Curbing the Arms Race. Five nations now have the capacity to explode nuclear weapons. At least 10 more have the technical capability to develop nuclear weapons in the next few years. It is in the common interest of the nuclear powers—and in the long-term interest of all mankind—to prevent the further spread of these weapons.

The obstacles to a treaty on nonproliferation are not insoluble. The U.S. treaty draft prohibits giving ownership, possession, or control of nuclear weapons within the NATO alliance.

TEST BAN

The Soviet Union appears to have dropped its insistence that a nonproliferation treaty must prohibit consultation on nuclear matters. In return, the United States should be willing to accept provisions foreclosing sharing in ownership or control of nuclear weap-

ons by the Germans or other nonnuclear powers through some kind of multilateral forces. And it should also be possible to devise adequate security guarantees to nonnuclear powers, perhaps through parallel declarations by nuclear powers confirmed in a U.N. resolution.

Further efforts should be made to conclude a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. The art of seismic detection does not yet permit distinguishing underground nuclear explosions from earthquakes without on-site inspection. The Soviet Union does not accept this proposition, and rejects the idea of on-site inspections. But a solution may lie in an international effort to agree on present possibilities of detection and to develop improved methods.

Work must also go forward on general and complete disarmament. Even with some measures of arms control, the maintenance of huge nuclear stockpiles and the modern methods of delivering them mean a substantial risk of nuclear war for our generation.

Obviously, progress toward general and complete disarmament and toward many measures of arms control requires the cooperation of Communist China. Its involvement in disarmament talks, whether bilaterally or at the existing Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference or at a World Disarmament Conference, should be actively encouraged.

KEEPING PEACE

Keeping the Peace. International cooperation to strengthen the United Nations is essential for general and complete disarmament. It is also essential to reduce the risks of violence while we live in the shadow of the arms race.

The United Nations needs an effective standby military capacity to deal with peace-keeping emergencies. This can be developed within the present constitutional structure.

Every effort must be made to enable the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility in the peacekeeping field. But past experience with the Soviet Union and the prospect of Communist China's membership in the Council suggest the need to retain the General Assembly's power to authorize peacekeeping operations—operations in which forces are contributed on a voluntary basis and deployed to the territory of countries with their consent.

If certain members will not pay assessments for these operations, other methods of financing such as non-mandatory apportionment will have to be found to assure a fair sharing of the cost. And the U.N.'s military capability should be augmented through the earmarking and training of national contingents on a broad geographical basis.

The United States could use military assistance funds to help less developed countries prepare units for U.N. service. Together with other countries, we also might make military bases available to the U.N. both for training and for actual use in peacekeeping emergencies.

Concern with the U.N.'s peacekeeping capacity has recently been accompanied by increasing interest in the problems of peaceful settlement and peaceful change. This is as it should be.

More needs to be done to anticipate and resolve situations which could lead to armed conflict. More needs to be done to attack the root causes of conflicts temporarily arrested by the interposition of peacekeeping forces.

TRADE EXPANSION

Expanding World Trade. The Expansion Act gave U.S. negotiators new authority to remove trade barriers, but it came when the Common Market was preoccupied with its internal problems; 10 years earlier it might have produced dramatic results. Nevertheless, every effort must be made to salvage a meaningful settlement from the Kennedy

Round and to prevent backsliding from liberal trade policies on both sides of the Atlantic.

The United States will have to revise some nontariff barriers, such as the American selling-price method of valuation on chemical imports, and be prepared to subject domestic farm programs to international negotiation.

And after the Kennedy Round ends, we should put ourselves in a position to move even more boldly—proposing a treaty for gradual but complete elimination of tariffs within 25 years.

The United States has fallen behind other free world countries in expanding trade with Eastern Europe. The legislation which President Johnson sent to the Congress last spring would at least enable American negotiators to offer most-favored-nation tariff treatment to countries such as the Soviet Union, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia in exchange for concessions of equivalent significance to us. It deserves to be enacted, and followed up with further measures to expand trade on a basis of mutual advantage.

DEVELOPMENT AID

Aiding Economic Development. The rate of increase of gross national product in the less developed countries slipped from 5 percent in 1950-54 to 4 percent in 1960-64.

With population growth averaging at least 2 or 3 percent in most of these countries, per capita income for the group is rising only about 1 percent a year. If these trends continue, their average per capita income, now about \$120, will be only about \$170 in the year 2000—while the present \$3000 per capita income of the United States will grow to some \$5000 or \$6000.

Unfortunately, financial assistance to the developing countries has begun to level off, and the burden of debt service increasingly offsets the transfer of new resources.

Congress has been reluctant to increase bilateral assistance, to reduce or eliminate interest rates on development loans, or to provide assurance of continuity through multi-year authorizations of appropriations. But a bold proposal to transfer additional resources through international agencies such as the International Development Association might meet with a better Congressional response.

At the very least, American policy should aim at increasing to \$1 billion a year the "soft" lending of the International Development Association and raising to \$300 million a year the pre-investment outlays of the U.N. Development Program. A U.S. offer to put up 40 percent of these sums on a matching basis could demonstrate the U.S. commitment to development and restore forward movement now lacking in multilateral aid efforts.

WORLD FINANCE

Organizing World Finance. For the past eight years, the United States has run substantial deficits in its balance of payments. These deficits have been partly financed by increased foreign dollar holdings, but they have also been paid for by large reductions in our gold stocks.

The United States cannot go on losing gold indefinitely. Yet elimination of the deficit may leave the world short of the liquidity needed for the continued expansion of world trade. And measures taken to reduce the deficit may have unfortunate consequences.

Generalizations in this complex field are dangerous. It would appear, however, that the world's gold supply is growing too slowly to finance the growing volume of world trade and that the United States can no longer take the principal responsibility for supplementing it.

Other nations therefore must bear a growing share of responsibility for increasing world liquidity, by increasing the credit facilities in the International Monetary Fund,

by creating a new form of "owned" reserves, or by some combination of the two.

If a new reserve unit is created, the national currencies paid by the developed countries in exchange for it could be used for long-term lending in the less developed world.

POPULATION GROWTH

Curbing Population Growth. There is a growing realization that significantly higher living standards in the less developed countries will never be achieved if the population goes on doubling every 20 or 30 years, and there is increasing awareness that if we do not make voluntary family planning possible in this generation, we may make compulsory family planning inevitable in some countries in the future.

The U.S. Government is now providing direct support for family planning efforts through technical, financial, and commodity aid. The big question is no longer whether the United States will help but whether the countries concerned will move fast enough to train and deploy the necessary administrators, doctors, and health workers.

The United Nations, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the U.N. Regional Economic Commissions and their demographic centers—all should be encouraged to work together to assist in effective national programs of family planning.

WORLD CONSERVATION

Conserving the World's Resources. In the headlong thrust toward industrialization and urbanization, man risks undermining the very basis of his civilization—the resources of his planet.

Both the industrial countries and the countries seeking rapid industrialization need to do a better job of conserving precious minerals, preserving wildlife and natural areas, avoiding air and water pollution, developing additional water resources through desalting sea water, and controlling the toxic consequences of drugs and pesticides. The time has surely come for more effective international cooperation in the central task of preserving the balance of nature.

The report of the White House Conference Committee on the Conservation of Resources offers significant proposals for action. It urges an International Trust for the World Heritage to identify, establish, develop and help manage natural areas and archaeological sites of unique value to the world community.

It calls for better regulation of the world's fishing practices to prevent depletion of the marine harvest. It asks cooperative efforts to deal with the contamination of man's environment by pesticides, oil pollution of the high seas, and the disposal of nuclear wastes. It proposes an international authority to exploit metal deposit on the ocean floor which may soon be extractable in large quantities.

OUTER SPACE

Exploring Outer Space. The United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to a treaty designed to keep nuclear weapons out of space and prohibiting the use of the moon and other celestial bodies from use as military bases. It is the first treaty governing space exploration.

Joint ventures in the launching of astronauts have been considered impractical because neither the Soviet Union nor the United States would permit the other nation to gain access to military information. But astronauts launched separately by the two countries can meet in outer space and work on joint projects.

We should explore the possibility of lunar or orbital laboratories jointly operated by the two countries in the name of the United Nations. At first these laboratories might consist only of equipment; later they might be manned by astronauts of various countries.

These joint laboratories could gather infor-

mation about the solar system as well as about our own planet. Eventually they might be the basis of a U.N. inspection service capable of patrolling borders and monitoring arms control agreements.

Expanding the Exchange of Ideas. Modern technology and culture are breaking down many official barriers. The United States can assist in this process by seeking the bolder programs of exchange of teachers and students, newspapers and books, motion pictures and cultural presentations. For example, the United States could offer Soviet leaders the opportunity to address Americans regularly on television, in return for the same privilege to us in the Soviet Union. We could propose to exchange time on the Voice of America for the same amount of time on Radio Moscow.

More can be done to encourage private groups around the world to strengthen the United Nations' role in this field, including the capacity of the U.N.'s Department of Public Information to bring the story of U.N. activities to the peoples of the world. The United States should encourage the use of communication satellites by the U.N. for this purpose, at special rates or without charge.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Protecting Human Rights. The United Nations has designated 1968, the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as Human Rights Year.

The United States has taken important action to promote human rights at home, but it must go further in making the promotion of human rights a central element in its foreign policy. One step long overdue is the ratification of the human rights treaties now before the U.S. Senate—the conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women. Ratification of the Genocide Convention, another treaty pending in the Senate, would also be desirable.

The United States should work for adoption of a proposal now before the U.N. to create a High Commissioner for Human Rights. Such a Commissioner could present a professional and comprehensive report each year on the progress of member governments in implementing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He could deal with specific complaints and assist members in organizing domestic institutions for the protection of human rights.

It is to be hoped that the President's Special Committee will support bold measures of the kind outlined in this agenda and that the improved dialogue between U.S. citizens and their Government resulting from the White House Conference will yield more and better ideas.

BOLD CONCEPT

But a dialogue between American citizens or Americans and their Government is no substitute for a dialogue with the other peoples and governments of the world. If we really want to implement the bold concept of International Cooperation Year, then let us propose to the Soviet Union that our best qualified citizens meet with theirs to explore each of the 30 subjects discussed at the White House Conference, or other subjects of their choice.

These meetings could be of the same character as the famous "Pugwash" conferences—scientists, scholars and professional men of both countries would participate in their individual capacities without committing their respective governments.

If a series of meetings of this kind were held, it could not fail to have a salutary effect on Soviet-American relations. Perhaps these conferences could even be broadened to include citizens from other Communist countries. Through such a program we could supplement a policy of containment with a policy of engagement—engage-

ment of all parts of our societies on all relevant subjects in a cooperative quest for peace.

President Kennedy, in his American University speech, conveyed the essential spirit with which we should approach such a new effort of peaceful cooperation. "Peace," he declared, "need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it."

"Our problems are manmade," President Kennedy said, "therefore they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants."

SPEAKING AS A PRIVATE CITIZEN

Richard N. Gardner is currently professor of Law and International Relations at Columbia University and senior adviser to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. He has been actively involved in fashioning the foreign policy of the United States since 1961, when he left the Columbia faculty to become deputy assistant secretary of state for International Organization Affairs. He left the State Department in 1965.

The article on this page is excerpted from Gardner's latest book, "Blueprint for Peace," published recently by McGraw-Hill, and, he says, is his private view. In addition to Gardner's proposals, the book contains 30 reports submitted to the White House Conference on International Cooperation in at the end of 1965, of which Gardner was chairman. He has published two other books, "Sterling Dollar Diplomacy," a history of U.S. foreign economic policy from the Atlantic Charter to the Marshall Plan, and "In Pursuit of World Order," an analysis of American policy in international organizations.

Gardner was born in New York in 1927, served in the Second World War, was graduated from Harvard College in 1948 and from Yale Law School in 1951. He went to Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar, and he was awarded a doctoral degree in 1961. After three years with a New York law firm, he joined the faculty of Columbia.

During his service at the State Department, Gardner was directly involved with the international organizational aspects of such problems as outer space, trade and aid. He has been a member of a number of U.S. delegations to international conferences and was a member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. at the last six sessions of the General Assembly.

ARMS CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an article entitled "Charade On Arms Control Pact," written by Joseph Kraft, and published in the Washington Post of recent date. The article should be of interest to all who are hoping that we will secure a nonproliferation treaty in the near future.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

CHARADE ON ARMS CONTROL PACT

(By Joseph Kraft)

Important gains in two fields of arms control are in prospect for later this year.

But to understand what is happening it is first necessary to penetrate elaborate charades now being played out in exquisite detail with a view toward disarming nationalistic and military critics of arms control in West Germany, the United States and the Soviet Union.

One of these charades, which I will make the subject of this column, centers on the non-proliferation treaty currently under

negotiation before the United Nations Disarmament Committee in Geneva. The other, which I will discuss in a subsequent column, centers on the anti-ballistic missile, or ABM.

The non-proliferation treaty obliges signatory nations not to give or receive nuclear weapons. For the non-nuclear states, the treaty would set up in Article III a safeguard system subjecting their programs for peaceful uses of nuclear energy to international inspection.

Many groups in many countries have doubts about the treaty. But the truly critical opposition lies with the nationalist wing of West German opinion ranging from the extreme right towards Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss.

For Strauss and his followers could use the denial of nuclear status to Germany as a pretext for whipping up deep currents of nationalistic opinion. They might, in that case, blow up the shaky coalition government led by Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger and Foreign Minister Willy Brandt, or at least cause it to turn against the treaty.

If that happened, if the Germans balked, the treaty would be dead. For the minimal Soviet need is a visible muzzling of the Germans in a way that can be used to build up the standing of the present Russian leadership in their own country and Communist Europe.

The purpose of the charade is to neutralize Strauss. It got under way three weeks ago when Foreign Minister Brandt came to Washington for talks with Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Apparently they decided to give special attention to one of the many obscure reservations dimly voiced about the treaty by Strauss and his followers.

Brandt, looking very grave, alluded to the issue at a briefing on Feb. 8. Rusk took it up in his news conference on Feb. 9. The issue they chose to highlight was the issue of whether the treaty would deny Germany the fruits of industrial research in the nuclear field.

With Brandt and Rusk seemingly concerned about the industrial fruits, Strauss and his followers went wild on the matter. In a storm of wrathful statements, they made the industrial issue the centerpiece of their opposition to the treaty.

They charged that the treaty was a means of keeping Germany down forever—"a diabolical instrument of Morgenthauism," as former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer said in an allusion to the plan for dividing Germany advanced by the late American Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, in 1945.

The outburst of German opposition had an immediate impact on the treaty talks. When they resumed in Geneva last week, uncertainty about Article III made it impossible for the United States and Russia to publish an agreed draft of the treaty. And at that point alarmists took flight.

But the rest of the script is already visible. For the German nationalists have now been exposed as the major obstacles to agreement.

SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the President has asked Congress to turn its attention as soon as possible to enacting legislation designed to expand and improve the social security system in order to make it possible for older Americans to live their retirement years in dignity and self-respect, not in poverty and despair.

Incredible new discoveries in medical knowledge coupled with a steady improvement in nutrition have given Americans the precious gift of longer life. The statisticians tell us that a person retiring at age 65 has another 13 years of

life. Those remaining years should be years spent with some measure of independence. All too often, however, they are years spent in an all-absorbing struggle to maintain a marginal standard of living on an inadequate income.

In my mail the other day was a heart-breaking letter from a 73-year-old woman alone in the world and living on a \$74 social security pension. In part she wrote:

I went to the store down the street with my last money left till I get my next check from the government. I got me a dozen eggs and a loaf of bread and some dry milk. Came time to pay and I didn't have enough cash. So I put out my hand with all my change and told the lady to take all I have and give me what I can buy. So she gave me the bread and dry milk and not but four eggs. Senator, can't the government raise our check a few dollars?

Everything we can do to increase social security benefits, consistent with the administration of the Social Security trust fund on a sound financial basis, we must do. We must give first priority to human considerations, while at the same time giving due weight to actuarial considerations.

The President's proposal calls for an increase in the earnings base covered by social security. In 1938 the \$3,000 earnings base represented the total earnings of 97 percent of all workers covered by social security. While the earnings base has been increased from time to time, it has not kept step with increases in wages. As a consequence, while the number of workers having earnings above the established base grows larger the proportion of their earnings replaced in benefits grows smaller. By proposing to increase the earnings base the President has eliminated a significant flaw in the social security program.

As the cost of living has risen, the funds available to retired people have not kept pace. It is incumbent on us all to give full support to the President's social security program which will help to lift the burden of want from the shoulders of the aged.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

A CALL FOR REALISM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have pondered at length with respect to President Johnson's message on crime in America. Many Senators have commended the administration's concern over crime and its wide-reaching ramifications. I, too, applaud the President for his vigorous and unswerving desire to bring about a reversal of the trend toward utter chaos on our streets.

In many respects, I am in accord with what the President has said. It may be noted that I am a cosponsor of S. 917, which seeks to implement some of the recommendations contained in the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act proposed by the President.

There is something left out of the President's message, however, which I believe to be a grievous omission. I felt it when I first read the message, and my

uneasiness has been crystallized into real concern now that the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has issued its report entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society."

I am referring to the complete absence in the President's message of any consideration of the profoundly adverse effects of recent Supreme Court decisions upon the ability of local law enforcement officers to carry out their responsibilities.

In his message, the President quotes Abraham Lincoln as having said:

Let reverence for the laws . . . become the political religion of the nation.

I believe, however, an expansion of this quotation by Abraham Lincoln is in order. He said:

Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling-books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

I should like to emphasize a portion of this wise admonition; that is, let reverence for the laws be "enforced in courts of justice."

I submit that the honorable and progressive police of this Nation, who make up the great majority of the profession, are sacrificing unceasingly upon the altars of justice. They know, however, that it is fundamental that the law must be given full force in order that the rights and liberties of the people of our society may be protected. They are witnessing, day by day, growing restrictions upon their ability to provide the protection which they are charged with giving to the citizens they serve.

President Johnson pointed out in his message that crime—and the fear of crime—has become a public malady. He revealed that a survey made in high crime areas of two of our largest cities found that 43 percent of the people interviewed stayed off the streets at night; 35 percent did not speak to strangers; 21 percent used only cabs and cars at night; 20 percent would like to move to another neighborhood—all because of their fear of crime. I know that these citizens and millions more like them would prefer to see the menace of the depraved criminal removed from our streets.

More and more, because of unrealistic Supreme Court decisions, America is becoming not the land of the free, but the land of the freed criminal. It is, in many cities, becoming the lawbreaker's domain where he reigns supreme because the law-abiding citizen is intimidated, the police are rendered nearly impotent, and the criminal is encouraged as he sees his fellow hoodlums escape justice through loopholes created by technicalities. In 1926, Supreme Court Justice Cardozo asked this question: "A criminal must go free because the constable has blundered?" I believe this is what

alarms the police, and not only the police but also the general public: that a vicious criminal is allowed to go free because law enforcement officers, through alleged overzealousness, possible errors in judgment, or because of lack of familiarity with the complex restrictions placed upon them, sometime err in dealing with the prisoner and with evidence. As has been pointed out by a police executive, there is no question that police on occasion make errors—if we functioned in a utopian world in which all policemen were infallible, there would be little, if any, need for the higher courts.

It is my firm contention that the majority of those on the Supreme Court have lost touch with reality. Apparently, they are too greatly insulated from the harsh realities of crime. I am not going to reel off the available plethora of horrifying statistics today concerning crime. I believe that those responsible for the dismaying decisions of late are too removed from reality by their more rarified surroundings, that they are so far away from the "madding crowd's ignoble strife" that they cannot see from their Mount Olympian chambers that these statistics represent flesh-and-blood, suffering victims of the most despicable of violations against innocent children, women, and men.

The sanctity which characterizes the atmosphere in the U.S. Supreme Court Building is entirely proper. But, it is far removed from the subhuman jungle of crime on the streets. Crime is no ethereal threat. Crime is stark reality, and judgment and punishment must be just as starkly realistic.

Compassion is a worthy trait of man. But, compassion cannot be reserved for the criminal alone. It must also be extended to the law-abiding citizen who lives in growing fear for the safety of his family and himself. The majority of the Supreme Court Justices, in cloaking themselves in their judicial robes, seem to have forgotten this. It is time for them to realize that, as someone once said, "A halo does not have to fall very far to become a noose." And the Supreme Court's halo is rapidly helping to fashion a noose about the throat of our law-abiding citizens.

The purpose of this Nation as set forth in the preamble to the Constitution is to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

When our forefathers thought of establishing justice, I am sure they meant justice for all and not a tenuous justice for the habitual transgressor. In the early days of our country, those who did not abide by the law were punished and punished severely. The Constitution was a document of realism, and I am sure the framers would be appalled to see it used today as a shield for lawbreakers.

We all know, consideration is being given to proposing an amendment to the Constitution to override and clarify certain Supreme Court decisions. I think it is shameful that the legislative branch must consider taking such a drastic step merely because our Supreme Court will

not listen to the prevailing public sentiment.

My feelings, I believe, are vindicated by the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in the chapter on "The Police." The Commission comments that—

Standard police procedures that are more intrusive have, during the last 30 years, been increasingly circumscribed by court rulings. Personal and property searches and the seizure of the evidence they yield, the use of informants, the arrest of demonstrators, and stationhouse detention and questioning of suspects have been more and more rigorously measured by the courts against the constitutional standards of due process, right to counsel, probable cause, privilege against self-incrimination, prompt presentment in court, and the rights of free speech and peaceable assembly. . . . It is evident that every restriction that is placed on police procedures by the courts—or anyone else—makes deterring or solving crimes more difficult. However, it is also evident that police procedures must be controlled somehow. . . . Nevertheless many police officers and citizens believe that recent judicial interpretations of the Constitution and various statutes have unduly and inappropriately inhibited the work of the police and so have made it harder for police to protect the public. Part of this feeling stems, no doubt, from the sharp contrast between the tense, fast-moving situations in which policemen are called upon to make split-second decisions, and the calm that prevails in the appellate courts while lawyers and judges argue the merits of those decisions, after having searched lawbooks for apposite precedents. Another part of it results from the fact that many of those court decisions were made without the needs of law enforcement, and the police policies that are designed to meet those needs, being effectively presented to the court. If judges are to balance accurately law enforcement needs against human rights, the former must be articulated. They seldom are. Few legislatures and police administrators have defined in detail how and under what conditions certain police practices are to be used. As a result, the courts often must rely exclusively on intuition and common sense in judging what kinds of police action are reasonable or necessary, even though their decisions about the actions of one police officer can restrict police activity in the entire Nation.

The Commission also makes reference to the case of *Miranda* against Arizona, which prohibited by a 5-to-4 decision, the questioning of a suspect in custody unless counsel is present or the subject expressly waives his rights to counsel. The Commission reported that it believed it is too early to assess the effect of the *Miranda* decision on law enforcement's ability to secure confessions and to solve crimes.

But—

The Commission added—

This and other decisions do represent a trend toward findings by the judiciary that previously permitted police practices are unconstitutionally offensive to the dignity and integrity of private citizens. The need for legislative and administrative policies to guide police through the changing world of permissible activity is pressing. . . . If the present trend continues, it is quite likely that some current investigative practices and procedures thought by police to be proper and effective will be held to be unconstitutional or subjected to restrictive rules.

I think it is vital to note also that four distinguished members of the Commission felt compelled to add a supplemental statement to the Commission's report which was concurred in by three other equally distinguished Commission members. In this addendum, the Commission members said:

There is a serious question, now being increasingly posed by jurists and scholars whether some of these (constitutional) rights have been interpreted and enlarged by (Supreme) Court decision to the point where they now seriously affect the delicate balance between the rights of the individual and those of society. Or, putting the question differently, whether the scales have tilted in favor of the accused and against law enforcement and the public further than the best interest of the country permits. . . . Whatever the reason, the trend of decisions strikingly has been towards strengthening the rights of accused persons and limiting the powers of law enforcement. It is a trend which has accelerated rapidly at a time when the nation is deeply concerned with its apparent inability to deal successfully with the problem of crime. We think the results must be taken into account in any mobilization of society's resources to confront this problem. . . . We are passing through a phase in our history of understandable, yet unprecedented, concern with the rights of accused persons. This has been welcomed as long overdue in many areas. But the time has come for a like concern for the rights of citizens to be free from criminal molestation of their persons and property. In many respects, the victims of crime have been the forgotten men of our society—inadequately protected, generally uncompensated, and the object of relatively little attention by the public at large. Mr. Justice White has said: "The most basic function of any government is to provide for the security of the individual and of his property." Unless this function is adequately discharged, society itself may well become so disordered that all rights and liberties will be endangered.

These members of the Commission call for the achievement of three essential ends: First, an adequate opportunity must be provided the police for interrogation at the scene of the crime, during investigations and at the stationhouse, with appropriate safeguards to prevent abuse; second, the legitimate place of voluntary confessions in law enforcement must be reestablished and their use made dependent upon meeting due process standards of voluntariness; and, third, provision must be made for comment on the failure of an accused to take the stand, and also for reciprocal discovery in criminal cases.

Pointing out that the Constitution contemplates amendment and that no part of it should be so sacred that it remains beyond review, the Commission concludes:

If, as now appears likely, a constitutional amendment is required to strengthen law enforcement in these respects, the American people should face up to the need and undertake necessary action without delay.

To which I say amen.

These are not the thoughts of individuals unfamiliar with the laws of our land nor of people inexperienced in dealing with the criminal element. They are some of the most distinguished people of our time, and I ask unanimous consent to have their identities and backgrounds printed in the *Record* at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the philosophy expressed by these authorities was advanced some time ago by former Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach who, on December 3, 1964, said:

It is not necessary to dismiss anyone who believes in the rights of the individual as a coddler of criminals. Nor is it necessary to dismiss one who believes in strict law enforcement as a cop-lover or a sadist. The aims of each side should be aims of both. . . . One thing I can say is that we have no right to continue to leave the issue as murky, no matter how passionately murky, as it is. To do so is to pass the buck, and the place the buck stops is with the policeman. While we, on the plateau, may argue, it is the policeman, on the spot, who must try to sort out all that philosophy. It is he who must, in the heat of the moment, make a decision to which devoted judges may later devote days of deliberation—and even then divide, 5 to 4.

It is the responsibility of the U.S. Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. According to the dictionary, interpret means first, to explain or tell the meaning of; translate; elucidate; and, second, to construe in the light of individual belief, judgment, or interest.

No right-thinking American would wish that the meaning of the Constitution be distorted to give aid immorally to a certain segment of society. At the same time, no right-thinking American can afford to tolerate for long a series of judicial interpretations which jeopardize the law-abiding citizens of our society. There is no question but that the Supreme Court's decisions have been influenced by the tenor of the times in years gone by. It would seem, however, that its decisions today are completely out of consonance with the Constitution's promises of domestic tranquillity, general welfare, and the blessings of liberty.

Our Government was built upon the foundation of separation of powers—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. While this separation is essential to the durability of our Republic, I feel it is time that the executive and the judiciary interpret for the Supreme Court the full meaning of the fear that pervades our civilization today as it becomes more infiltrated by hordes of criminals.

I believe that the President should recognize and publicly identify appellate and Supreme Court decisions as major contributing factors to the increase in lawlessness.

His Commission has clearly set forth the impact of these decisions upon the attitudes of criminals and the ability of the police to carry out their duties. And in ignoring these admonitions, I believe he has committed an oversight of great magnitude.

I believe that my colleagues in this body should make every effort to gage the desires of their constituents and then legislate accordingly.

It is well known that I am a supporter of effective law enforcement, and I believe our police agencies can take heart

in the proposals made by President Johnson and echoed in the Senate and the House to provide the wherewithal in order that they might function to the highest degree of efficiency. While the furnishing of material benefits should certainly provide our police with a stimulus, I do think that we would accomplish even more by showing the individual police officer that his Nation is behind him in his efforts to curb lawlessness. While we may give him the most sophisticated devices of detection, communication and transportation, he still cannot do his job unless spiritual support extends throughout all echelons of government.

In yet another portion of the President's message, I detect a paradox. His Commission and his message call for better trained and better educated law enforcement officers with constantly higher educational requirements being made for recruits.

At the same time, the President asks for uniformed "community service officers" who would maintain close relations with people in their areas and be alert to potentially dangerous areas that should be brought to the attention of other city agencies for prompt action. These officers, according to the President's recommendation, might not meet conventional educational requirements; they might even have had minor encounters with the law as teenagers. In my conversations with police authorities, I find little agreement with this approach. Already, the police are saddled with too many sociological responsibilities which should be handled by welfare agencies. This is no time to start diluting the growing professionalism of police work by hiring officers who are below standard in character and education. This activity, I feel, should rightfully repose in welfare agencies and our police should be left the job of enforcing the law and preventing crime. In closing, I should like to dispel a fear which seems to be the rallying cry in the ultraliberal camp. And that is the fear that the police have become too powerful. I do not believe that this is so, and I believe they can never be when one considers the various safeguards which characterize our modern-day society. Even so, I believe that the individual police officer today is a better man than he ever was before.

The police of this country have a Law Enforcement Code of Ethics. Its first paragraph states:

As a Law Enforcement Officer, my fundamental duty is to serve mankind; to safeguard lives and property; to protect the innocent against deception, the weak against oppression or intimidation, and the peaceful against violence or disorder; and to respect the Constitutional rights of all men to liberty, equality and justice.

I believe that the police as a group are no better or no worse than men in any other field of honest endeavor. But, I believe the majority of them adhere to this code, and I believe that, in a Republic such as ours, those who do not shall quickly be brought to light.

I believe that, with the proper support, the police can and will do their job; but that, if this support flags, if through unrealistic treatment of the police we

terrorize the officer rather than instill respect for law in the lawbreaker, a chaos—of which we have already seen the beginnings right here in the Nation's Capital—will engulf us all.

EXHIBIT 1

AUTHORS OF SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT TO THE COMMISSION REPORT

Leon Jaworski—Houston, Tex.; attorney, senior partner, Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman, Bates & Jaworski; U.S. Army, Colonel, Chief, War Crimes Trial Section, European Theater, Legion of Merit, 1942-46; President, Houston Bar Association, 1949; President, Texas Civil Judicial Council, 1951-52; President, American College of Trial Lawyers, 1961-62; President, Texas Bar Association, 1962-63; Special Assistant U.S. Attorney General, 1962-65; Special Counsel, Attorney General of Texas, 1963-65; Executive Committee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; Trustee, Houston Legal Foundation; Fellow, American Bar Foundation; U.S. Member, Permanent (International) Court of Arbitration; Member, National Science Commission; Chairman, Governor's Committee on Public School Education, State of Texas.

Ross L. Malone—Roswell, N. Mex.; attorney, partner, Atwood & Malone; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant Commander, 1942-46; Deputy Attorney General of the United States, 1952-53; President, American Bar Association, 1958-59; President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; Council, American Law Institute; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers; Board of Trustees, Southern Methodist University.

Lewis Franklin Powell, Jr.—Richmond, Va.; attorney, partner, Hunton, Williams, Gay, Powell & Gibson; U.S. Army Air Force, Colonel awarded Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Croix de Guerre With Palms, 1942-46; Member, Virginia State Board of Education, 1961-; President, American Bar Association, 1964-65; Trustee, Washington and Lee University and Hollis College; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers; Vice President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee and General Counsel, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.

Robert Gerald Storey—Dallas, Tex.; attorney, partner, Storey, Armstrong & Steger; Phi Beta Kappa, Order of the Coif; U.S. Army, 1st Lieutenant, 1918-19, Colonel, Bronze Star, Legion of Merit, 1941-45; Assistant Attorney General, State of Texas, 1921-23; Executive Trial Counsel for the United States, trial of major Axis war criminals, Nuremberg, Legion of Honor (France), 1945-46; Dean, Southern Methodist University Law School, 1947-59; President, Texas Bar Association, 1948-49; President, American Bar Association, 1952-53; Member, Hoover Commission, 1953-55; President, Inter-American Bar Association, 1954-1956; American Bar Association Gold Medal, 1956; Vice Chairman, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1957-63; President, Southwestern Legal Foundation.

CONCURRING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Garrett H. Byrne—Boston, Mass.; attorney, District Attorney, Suffolk County, Mass.; Member, Massachusetts House of Representatives, 1924-28; President, National District Attorneys Association, 1963-64; President, Massachusetts District Attorneys Association, 1963-64; President, National District Attorneys Foundation.

Thomas J. Cahill—San Francisco, Calif.; Chief of Police, San Francisco; entered San Francisco Police Department as patrolman, 1942; Big Brother of the Year Award, 1964; Liberty Bell Award, San Francisco Bar Association, 1965; Vice President, International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1963-; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the Governor on the Law Enforcement Section of the Disaster Office of the State of California; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the School

of Criminology, City College, San Francisco; Member, National Advisory Committee, National Center on Police-Community Relations, Michigan State University.

Thomas C. Lynch—San Francisco, Calif.; Attorney General, State of California; Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1933-42; Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1943-51; District Attorney, San Francisco, Calif., 1951-64; Fellow, American College of Trial Lawyers; Advisory Committee on Prearrestment Code, American Law Institute.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ENACT 6 PERCENT SURTAX—SHOULD RESTORE INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the evidence that the Congress should not enact the 6 percent surtax and should restore promptly the investment credit grows daily.

Consider this morning's Wall Street Journal. I refer to the first four items in the column under the heading "Business and Finance." Let me quote from those items, because they call our attention to the state of the Nation's economy. The first item reads:

Rail-equipment makers report incoming orders for freight cars and locomotives have practically halted, largely as a result of last year's suspension of the 7% tax credit for new equipment purchases. Recent surveys indicate the industry's backlog has fallen by \$1,250,000,000, or 80%, from a year earlier. Although equipment companies are still running at full tilt, the months ahead spell sagging operations unless the carriers resume buying. Railroads and their suppliers are banding together in the hope of winning, at the earliest possible date, reinstatement of the tax credit, currently slated for restoration next Jan. 1.

The second item reads:

Machine tool orders last month fell 23% from December and 37% from January 1966. Order cancellations rose 43% from December and were three times the year-earlier rate. Incoming business has shown no improvement this month, tool builders said. Some industry sources called for prompt restoration of the 7% investment tax credit to stem the downtrend in tool buying.

The third item reads:

Steel buying for April delivery is lagging behind the month-ago rate of orders for shipment in March. The slowdown reverses the traditional trend. Because of seasonal demand, the second quarter usually shapes up as the strongest of the year for the steel industry. Most mills blame slow business from auto makers for the less-than-expected advance bookings.

The fourth item reads:

The auto sales slump is deepening, executives of the industry's top companies concede. Assembling in Chicago for the annual midwinter auto show, these officials revised downward their sales forecasts; most blamed severe winter weather for depressing retail deliveries recently to the lowest rate in five years. Many predicted sales in the 1967 model year could skid to 8.3 million, including imports, down nearly 9% from 1966-model volume.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, it is clear that the continuation of the suspension of the investment credit will hurt American business, slow down the growth of our economy, and very possibly increase unemployment.

There never was any price stabilization argument for suspending the in-

vestment credit. Inflation was never serious in the industries affected by investment in plant and equipment, and the slowdown in the growth of this sector of the economy so vital to our growth has been very great, indeed.

Finally, Mr. President, whatever case there had been for a tax increase is disappearing like snow in a hot oven on a July day in Washington as returns come in, showing the status of American business.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal of today to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Rail-equipment makers report incoming orders for freight cars and locomotives have practically halted, largely as a result of last year's suspension of the 7% tax credit for new equipment purchases. Recent surveys indicate the industry's backlog has fallen by \$1,250,000,000, or 80%, from a year earlier. Although equipment companies are still running at full tilt, the months ahead spell sagging operations unless the carriers resume buying. Railroads and their suppliers are banding together in the hope of winning, at the earliest possible date, reinstatement of the tax credit, currently slated for restoration next Jan. 1.

Machine tool orders last month fell 23% from December and 37% from January 1966. Order cancellations rose 43% from December and were three times the year-earlier rate. Incoming business has shown no improvement this month, tool builders said. Some industry sources called for prompt restoration of the 7% investment tax credit to stem the downtrend in tool buying.

Steel buying for April delivery is lagging behind the month-ago rate of orders for shipment in March. The slowdown reverses the traditional trend. Because of seasonal demand, the second quarter usually shapes up as the strongest of the year for the steel industry. Most mills blame slow business from auto makers for the less-than-expected advance bookings.

The auto sales slump is deepening, executives of the industry's top companies concede. Assembling in Chicago for the annual midwinter auto show, these officials revised downward their sales forecasts; most blamed severe winter weather for depressing retail deliveries recently to the lowest rate in five years. Many predicted sales in the 1967 model year could skid to 8.3 million, including imports, down nearly 9% from 1966-model volume.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO STUDY IMPACT OF VIETNAM WAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times reports this morning an exceedingly interesting policy of the Defense Department in scheduling production and inventory in military supply to ease the economy's transition to peace when it comes in Vietnam.

Whatever can be said for this policy from a military standpoint, and I leave that to the military experts in the Senate, it can be a significant and helpful economic policy.

It would mean that the kind of jolt the economy suffered after Korea would not be felt this time.

But it stresses once again, Mr. President, the great desirability of a congress-

sional investigation of the full impact of the Vietnam war on our economy and what we can do in a myriad of ways to adjust to its escalation or deescalation in terms of manpower, tax adjustments, Federal programs, and so forth.

I hope that the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, may be able to undertake this kind of a study in the near future. The results could be useful to the Congress in adjusting to what is becoming one of the biggest and most significant economic facts of life—the Vietnam war.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from this morning's New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GEARS OUTPUT TO THE WAR'S END—DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SEEKS TO AVOID PRODUCTION SLUMP AFTER CONFLICT IN VIETNAM—1953-54 RECESSION CITED—KOREAN AFTERMATH RECALLED—MILITARY ORDERS LINKED TO INVENTORY POSITIONS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 26.—The Defense Department is scheduling production and inventory of military items in a manner designed to prevent a sharp drop in production when the war in Vietnam ends.

The policy was disclosed recently by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

If it works as planned, there will not be a repetition of the Korean experience, when a precipitous decline in defense orders and production as the war ended helped bring on the 1953-54 recession.

POLICY EXPLAINED

However, the policy also means that defense expenditures will continue high, though they probably will drift gently downward, for many quarters after hostilities cease.

Thus, there will not be immediate availability of vast sums for domestic or tax cuts.

The new policy is based on the principle that inventories can be safely allowed to run down for items that are now in assembly-line production—ranging from bombs to airplanes.

Then, when peace comes, production can continue for the rebuilding of inventory.

Mr. McNamara described the policy in the following terms at a recent news conference:

"As you might expect, when the production lines are moving, we are able to meet our worldwide requirements with a lower inventory level than is required in peacetime, when many of the production lines are down."

"We had the option open to us of building our wartime inventories to the level required for peacetime—a high inventory—or holding them at the lower levels consistent with the moving production lines of the present. We have decided to hold them down."

PEAKS AND VALLEYS

The purpose, he said, is "to avoid large peaks and subsequent valleys."

As an example, he cited air ordnance, such as bombs.

The peacetime inventory requirement is one million tons. Current inventories however, have been run down to 600,000 tons.

Production is at a level that meets or exceeds current wartime consumption, rather than being built up to its maximum capability.

Then, when the war ends, in Mr. McNamara's words, "we can taper off our air ordnance production, instead of precipitously calling it to a halt."

He cited other areas in which the same policy is being followed, such as aircraft, helicopters and ground ordnance.

The aim is both to reduce pressure on the economy, where the danger until recently was overheating, and to avoid "precipitous declines" when peace comes.

SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS WILL ENABLE UNITED STATES TO CELEBRATE 1968 AS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the United Nations has designated 1968 as International Human Rights Year. Nineteen hundred and sixty-eight was selected because it marks the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948.

Twenty-two years ago in San Francisco President Truman forcefully expressed this Nation's deep commitment to the fledgling United Nations efforts toward establishing universal human rights, when he said:

Under this document (the Charter) we have good reason to expect the framing of an international Bill of Rights, acceptably to all the nations involved. That Bill of Rights will be as much a part of international life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The Charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and freedoms, and unless we can attain these objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

As was so frequently the case during his Presidency, Harry Truman, by these words at San Francisco, demonstrated himself to be a sage prophet.

President Truman, a full 22 years ago, recognized that elementary truth about international relations: Unless mankind is able to establish and guarantee universal human rights for all men, mankind will be unable to establish and guarantee permanent peace among all men.

Since 1948, the United States has made remarkable domestic progress in the guaranteeing of basic human rights to all our citizens. It is a record of progress in which all of us can take real pride and justifiable satisfaction.

Unfortunately, this Nation's record internationally in the field of human rights has been as bad as our domestic accomplishments have been good. Of the four Human Rights Conventions—forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery—all drafted with U.S. assistance and adopted by U.S. persistence—the Senate has failed to ratify a single one.

Why? I am at a loss to understand the Senate's indifference or to explain the Senate's inaction. This same chamber which saw the enactment of two memorable human rights bills in 1964 and 1965 has recorded only deafening silence on the equally important question of universal human rights.

As of today, only nine nations, Bolivia, Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen, and the United States have failed to ratify a single one of these four conventions. This is an exclusive group in which I for one, do not covet American membership.

International Human Rights Year is only 9 months away. The Senate, and the Senate alone, can enable the United States to observe fittingly International Human Rights Year. This Nation and people everywhere will be able to celebrate when the Senate ratifies the Human Rights Conventions on forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery.

STREETS OF MILWAUKEE STILL THE SAFEST IN UNITED STATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this day when so many brickbats are thrown at our cities, and especially at the police departments of our cities, it is good to have something favorable and constructive to report.

I am proud to announce that recently Milwaukee, Wis., was found by the National Safety Council to have the safest streets in the Nation for both drivers and pedestrians. This was the third straight year Milwaukee has won this honor.

In spite of the growth in population, the immense increase in auto travel, the great increase in speed, and the tragic acceleration of death from traffic accidents, Milwaukee kept her fatalities in 1966 at the same low level as in 1965.

As the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I am very proud of this excellent Milwaukee record, and I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an article in the Milwaukee Journal reporting this great Milwaukee achievement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREETS OF MILWAUKEE STILL THE SAFEST IN UNITED STATES

Pedestrians and drivers were safer in Milwaukee in 1966 than in any other United States city of comparable size, the National Safety Council reported Thursday. It was the third consecutive year that the city has ranked first.

There were 64 traffic deaths in Milwaukee last year, the same number as in 1965. The death rate in 1966 was 2.1 persons for every 10,000 registered vehicles.

The safety council based its death rate computation on 62 deaths in 1966, a figure which did not include two more deaths early in 1967 from injuries received in 1966 accidents, according to the Milwaukee safety commission.

Second in the 750,000 to 1,000,000 population class was San Francisco, with a rate of 2.7 and 87 deaths. St. Louis was third with 3.1 and 93, followed, in order, by Washington, Dallas, Baltimore and Cleveland.

Traffic deaths nationally set a record with 52,500 killed, a 7% increase over 1965.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 17 the Woman's Wear Daily published two articles on the truth in lending bill. One article reported that several retail department store executives felt that they could live with the present version of the truth in lending bill. Mr. Frank G. Gillett, chairman of the board of Bullock's Department Store in Los Angeles, was quoted as saying in regard to the truth-in-lending bill, "I don't think it will make much difference to us."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the entire article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETAILERS WAIT AND SEE ON CONSUMER PACKAGE

Initial top retail reaction in Washington to the President's consumer message generally is unenthusiastic. That puts it mildly.

The proposed truth-in-lending law is a "misnomer," an official of Julius Garfinckel & Co. said. "I don't think any of us object to truth-in-lending, but the Douglas bill would have been impossible to operate under. The public is entitled to full credit disclosure . . . we have no reason for not wanting that known . . . but the bills have been unworkable."

In agreement was a Woodward & Lothrop executive, who said: "I don't think anyone objects to this type of legislation provided it can be handled in an intelligent way . . . if not confusing. This has been the stumbling block so far. The way it has been proposed up to this point, it would have caused too much confusion."

James Michaux, Washington representative for Federated Department Stores, noted President Johnson this year first called for clear and honest expression of credit costs in his State of the Union message.

"We agree with President Johnson in principle," Mr. Michaux said.

Retailers in Los Angeles reacted cautiously to the President's proposed legislation, generally begging off on commenting until they had time to study the salient points.

However, on the one familiar point, truth in lending, there seems to be an acceptance that some sort of credit disclosure bill eventually will be accepted and they must learn to live with it.

"I don't think it will make much difference to us," observed Bullock's chairman Frank G. Gillett. He felt consumers wouldn't react much differently if credit costs were spelled out in dollars rather than in monthly percentages, as they are now commonly done in California.

In New York, Melvin Dawley, president, Lord & Taylor, said, "I haven't had an opportunity to read the President's proposals yet, but I don't think any legitimate retailer will be adversely affected by them, since they have been using truth-in-lending for many years, and their customers know what they are being charged in interest. I am also sure that we are not selling any products that are harmful or dangerous, and we would not sell them even if there were not laws prohibiting such sales."

The President's truth package isn't aimed at legitimate retailers and will not add to their woes, is the opinion of top Philadelphia store officials. They declined to be quoted by name.

It was called "an attempt to weed out chiselers" that will affect the reputable store only "in the gigantic task of additional work that represents an unneeded welfare program for another segment of the population."

Leading Chicago retail officials deferred comment on the proposals to Congress.

Spokesmen for both Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward indicated their companies would have no official comment.

THE PROPOSED BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK—A BOTANICAL HAVEN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on February 12 attention was once again focused on the unique biological area of east Texas called the Big Thicket. In an article which appeared in the Austin American-Statesman, Miss Hazel Green

reminded her readers that 400,000 acres are all that remain of a natural estate once encompassing millions of acres and still containing countless examples of wildlife and vegetation that once flourished in abundance in this part of the world. She states that the Big Thicket is the home of hundreds of varieties of animals, birds, and reptiles; fungi that are unknown, unnamed, and unclassified; and 2,000 classified shrubs, plants, and trees, including holly trees that grow taller and more perfect than anywhere else in the world, reaching up to 13 feet in diameter. It is almost unbelievable to note that four out of the five carnivorous plants known in the world call the Big Thicket their native home.

As in all the correspondence I have received regarding the Big Thicket, this article repeats the notes of urgency which prompted me to introduce a bill to preserve the treasures of the Big Thicket in the form of a national park—S. 4. I share the concern of many conservation groups and individuals who want the Big Thicket of east Texas preserved for this generation and those which follow, and I reecho the hope of these same people that curfew will not ring for this living symbol of a bygone era which nature so painstakingly joined together and which man with his quest for progress is so mercilessly attempting to destroy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Miss Hazel Green on the Big Thicket published in the Austin American-Statesman of February 12, 1967, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURE TRAILS

(By the Travis Audubon Society)

Our great big beautiful State of Texas, about 170 million diversified acres, can boast of only less than a million acres devoted to park land (only about 60,000 acres of which are state park lands). We are on the verge of having two magnificent national parks in two unique areas: The Guadalupe Mountains area, which has already passed the Congress and been signed by the President, with \$12½ million appropriated for development, but which now must pass the Texas Legislature; and the Big Thicket area, covered by Bill S. 4 introduced by Sen. Yarborough Jan. 11.

When he introduced this bill covering 75,000 acres, Sen. Yarborough said: "The top item on my conservation agenda for Texas now becomes the conservation and preservation of a portion of the Big Thicket, a unique area . . . In the Texas Gulf coastal plain . . ."

At one time the Big Thicket covered millions of acres in 12 counties, which in prehistoric times were covered by an arm of the Gulf of Mexico, and washed at times by flood waters of the Mississippi River. This ultimately created an area of rich alluvial soils which receives an annual rainfall of from 45 to 50 inches. Now it is a mere remnant of its original vast pristine glory—about 400,000 acres in five counties—Liberty, Polk, Tyler, San Jacinto and Hardin. Those who know about these things and the rapid destruction and despoliation going on day by day, say there won't be any Big Thicket 10 years from now.

A forest jungle of approximately 2,000 square miles, the home of more than 2,000 classified trees, plants, shrubs; hundreds of animals, hundreds of varieties of birds and snakes; many alligators, turtles, frogs, moths,

butterflies and dragon flies of spectacular beauty; lichens of infinite and striking variety; fungi that are unknown, unnamed and unclassified, and around 300 varieties of mosses—that is the Big Thicket. Of the five carnivorous plants known in the world, four are native here. There are even beech trees; and holly trees that grow taller and more perfect than anywhere else in the world, and up to 13 feet in diameter.

The only Indian reservation in Texas is located on the northern edge—about 4,009 acres now reserved for the Alabama-Coushatta Indians.

Here is another unique paradise of America and Texas that will be lost to the world forever if we don't all lend our support to saving more of what's left. Many biologically, geologically and historically significant areas of the Big Thicket are already lost.

We should write Sen. Yarborough, Secretary Stewart Udall, and our U.S. Congressmen that we endorse this bill. The Texas House of Representatives has endorsed the bill by a vote of 139 to 0.

—HAZEL C. GREEN.

BUILDING AMERICA UNDER PRESIDENT JOHNSON: AFL-CIO RECOUNTS FABULOUS PROGRESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in an age of rapid change and rising human expectations, the Nation and its representatives often forget the accomplishments of yesterday as they debate the promise of tomorrow.

We in the 90th Congress should never forget that the programs we debate and approve will be built on the foundations of one of the greatest social and economic records ever proposed by an administration and enacted by any Congress of the United States.

I am pleased, therefore, to present a statement by the executive council of the highly respected American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations on the social progress achieved by our country under the far-seeing leadership of President Johnson, adopted February 22, 1967.

The statement reads as follows:

America is now beginning to reap the harvest of the great social legislation advanced by the Johnson administration and adopted by the 89th Congress.

It is a record unsurpassed in any period of democratic government. We are proud of the role played by the AFL-CIO, which initiated the fight for many of these programs and which actively supported them in the Congress.

On the first of February, the new minimum wage bill—the most effective anti-poverty legislation yet—became law. With that new bill, nine million more Americans gained the protection and benefits of that law. One billion dollars a year of new purchasing power was pumped into the economy.

The record of social progress during the Johnson Administration extends into many other broad areas of constructive action, for the welfare of all Americans:

1. Three million older Americans have received hospital care and 5½ million have received physicians' services under medicare just through January 31.

2. More than 19 million older Americans are protected under the hospital insurance part of medicare, and 17½ million have also signed up for supplementary medical insurance.

3. An additional million persons are receiving Social Security benefits today, as a result of the 1965 and 1966 amendments, who would otherwise not be receiving any benefits.

4. All 23 million Social Security beneficiaries are receiving monthly case benefits at least seven percent higher as a result of the 1965 amendments.

5. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is helping more than 8 million disadvantaged children through special programs in over 17,000 communities.

6. Library books, text books and other educational materials have been provided for 49 million school children and two million teachers under the Elementary and Secondary Education act.

7. More than 135,000 needy college students are being helped to continue their education through the new program of educational opportunity grants initiated last fall, and 190,000 students who could not otherwise afford to go to college are being aided through part-time jobs under the college work-study program.

8. Measles vaccine for 4½ million children has been made available to state and local health agencies under the 1965 amendments to the Vaccination Assistance act.

9. During the last four years there has been a \$9.3 billion, 72% expansion in Federal programs which directly combat poverty and assist the poor. More than 1,000 local communities have been mobilized for the war on poverty.

10. More than one million needy children have been helped by Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps and other programs.

11. More than one million persons are currently receiving training and new avenues of opportunity under manpower training and development programs.

Satisfying as this record is, much more remains to be done before America can afford to pause on its march forward in the social welfare field.

We are confident the President shares that view. He has already asked the Congress for broader programs and additional legislation in this area. For ourselves, we want to make this clear: the AFL-CIO will be working day in and day out to achieve the kind of society we seek—one in which insecurity, poverty and injustice no longer exist in our land.

Nothing less is worthy of America.

That is a fine record, Mr. President. As the AFL-CIO says, in part, the Johnson-congressional record is "unsurpassed in any period of democratic government." That is a true statement of fact. We all know it is true because we were the indispensable partners in the progress achieved in the last 2 years—progress of which every man should be proud, whatever party he represents.

The Nation's largest labor organization has rightfully called our attention to the gigantic strides made in giving greater economic protection to the workingman; the increased numbers of poor children now getting a better education; the older citizens whose lives will be freer from insecurity and doubt under medicare and expanded social security programs; the libraries, and textbooks which will enlighten and shape the minds of almost 50 million additional schoolchildren; the needy college student now advancing up the great ladder of learning because this Congress wanted it so; the many health, welfare, and job training programs which have been expanded.

These, the AFL-CIO executive council has cited. They could have cited many more. We who were here during those thrilling days know that we proudly joined our President in writing into law measures to dignify the citizen, measures which embody the full hopes and dreams of a democratic society.

But our work is not done. The AFL-CIO rightly suggests the record is not complete. No record for the people in a democracy is ever complete. The Nation, the Presidency, the Congress, our society are living things constantly growing. And so as we debate new programs and laws, and as we read of criticism at home and abroad, let us remember that we are building today's America on the solid foundations of the accomplishments of the Johnson administration and the dynamic 89th Congress—the Congress in which many of us had the honor to serve. It is a record which speaks for itself—a record in which we take deep pride as legislators.

CAN ATLAS SHRUG?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 16, I had the pleasant privilege of speaking before the American affairs meeting of the Los Angeles, Calif., chapter of Hadassah. I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my comments on that occasion be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN ATLAS SHRUG?

Today, the interests and the responsibilities of our nation are ubiquitous. Often it seems that America, like Atlas, is holding up all the world. We know the figure of the man whose tired arms continually support the earth, and whose load no one else will share, even for a brief respite. I wonder if Atlas would have seen the humor in the Wordsworth phrase "The world is too much with us; . . ." or, if he would have taken it, as too many people do today, as an ironic jab at the tragedy of our era.

Many Americans today have the same sort of "trapped" feeling that Atlas must have had. I am not referring to the young housewife or the middle-aged professional man, but to every American who asks the questions: Where does it end? How far do we go? What is our share in maintaining peace and decent human order?

At the end of World War II, when what remained of the whole human race was horrified by the ravages of global conflict, like a Phoenix from the ashes, there arose a bright new confidence in a system of collective security, of sharing risks, and of jointly confronting common dangers to world peace. In the first instance, this hope gave rise to the San Francisco Charter of the United Nations. It was followed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as a military defensive system against potential Soviet aggression. Other agreements were later made in almost every other region. These arrangements were not only military in character; they sought to find a basis for first-step disarmament and for arms control agreements, and to advance the cause of peace through economic development, in an over-all hoped for solution of the age-old ills of man: pestilence, famine, and the despair of forlorn poverty.

This was a bipartisan effort. As a Republican, I recall with great pride one of my illustrious predecessors, Arthur Vandenberg, Senator from Michigan, who spoke out two decades ago to bring to our country a clear understanding that there must be an interdependence among free peoples, that the United States could not—can not—"go it alone." It was Vandenberg and the men of the 81st Congress from both parties who slammed the door on America's outgrown policy of isolation. But the great hopes for world security, so bright in the aftermath of World War II under men like Vandenberg,

Winston Churchill, Dwight Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy, seem now to have been shattered, and broken beyond repair. France's De Gaulle, Egypt's Nasser, Rhodesia's Ian Smith, all refuse to accept the principle that one people's freedom is in pawn to another's safety.

In this nuclear age no one nation can stand alone against all comers. Foreign policy for our republic assumes a transcendent importance for the whole human race.

Once we lived in the secure protection of two oceans and a large navy. Today, any city on earth can be largely obliterated within moments by the flick of a finger. The order may come from either a reasoning or unreasoning mind.

Militarily, the United States is more powerful today than at any time in her history, but she has less security than ever before. That is the strange paradox of the nuclear age. The discoveries of science, and the streaking speeds of transportation and communication with 12,000 miles per hour intercontinental ballistic missiles have effectively and permanently eliminated the idea of living alone. Isolation is all gone. Whether we like it or not, we are all, Russians and Americans, Chinese and French, Israeli and Arab, Germans and Japanese—ultimately in hock to the reasoning process of a relatively small number of people who control the levers of power in the nuclear bastions of the so-called "Great Powers."

There are those who defend freedom, those who oppose, and those, hypnotized by dated ideologies, who have never been given a chance to know the difference. I believe those who believe in freedom vastly outnumber all the others.

All nations who value their independence have a common interest in and a responsibility for the defense of the free world. But, today our system of collective security, so hopefully unveiled, is in a sad state of disrepair.

As a consequence, enormous burdens have been heaped on the shoulders of the American people by the events of the last few years. Some 400,000 troops have been committed to the defense of South Vietnam. The United States and her allies in Asia carry on this costly conflict without any substantial help from our allies in Europe, who nevertheless, continue to benefit from the protection of the American nuclear defense forces—to say nothing of their economic resuscitation by our economy at the close of the Second World War.

There is a major threat to world peace from the madness now sweeping through Communist China, which approaches a giant internal convulsion. And this occurs while they continue to make strides towards an intercontinental nuclear force of their own.

The Soviet Union, which has at times shown some signs of coming to reason, continues, alas, to withhold her support from the peacekeeping efforts of the United Nations. This single fact, more than any other, has prevented us from taking further steps in establishing a sound international peace-keeping arrangement in that body.

Effective peacekeeping machinery cannot be built without help from all major powers, something which we do not have. Fundamental to any stabilization among the great powers is an understanding that no one nation may—or can—hope to benefit from initiating a nuclear conflict. In this situation, nothing is more vital than maintenance of a mutually acceptable halt to the 20-year old nuclear arms race.

On November 11, 1966, the Secretary of Defense gave the first confirmation by our government that the Soviet Union has begun to build a new defense system around one or more of its major cities, composed at least in part of Anti-Ballistic Missiles. We do not know everything about the capabilities of Soviet weapons. But we have grave apprehensions about this development, and

about its implications for the continuity of the human race.

The Soviet action, taken in secrecy, gravely prejudices the possibility of resolving our differences by rational and peaceful means. In the closing months of his Administration, President Eisenhower said: "In an age of rapidly developing technology, secrecy is not only an anachronism, it is downright dangerous. To seek to maintain a society in which a military move can be made in complete secrecy, while professing a desire to reduce the risk of war through arms control, is a contradiction." This contradiction which Eisenhower saw in the Soviet system remains. It lies at the heart of the Soviet Union's inability to contribute, as that nation should, to meaningful peacekeeping endeavors.

There is a severe limit to how long we can tolerate Soviet action without a military response of our own. We and the Russians both possess vast nuclear retaliatory capability. Ours is superior and considerably larger. There is nothing America can do to keep the Soviet Union from building and maintaining such a force, awesome as it may be, unless, by reason and by diplomacy, she were to urge terminating this excursion into needless nuclear escalation. We cannot permit the USSR to gain strategic military superiority over the United States.

Last December 7, I wired the President, respectfully calling on him to employ the most expeditious diplomatic channels to convey to the Soviet leaders, at the highest level, a concern of the American people on the issue of a renewed nuclear arms race. The President, in his State of the Union Message, disclosed that our government is seeking an agreement in this area. Every American devoutly hopes that we may succeed in this undertaking. In a very real sense, we deal here with the future of this planet.

In 1960, President Eisenhower's doctrine, as expressed to the United Nations General Assembly, was:

"Ours is a world of growing danger. There is a danger of surprise attack prepared in secret. There is the danger of nuclear attack from outer space. There is the menace of constantly mounting stockpiles of nuclear weapons and of large armies. There is the peril of spreading capability for the production of modern weapons to greater numbers of nations. There is the hazard of war by accident or miscalculation. We hold these dangers must be dealt with now."

That was nearly seven years ago. How far have the advances of weaponry progressed and, by contrast, how little has been done to resolve and keep them in control of rational men?

Because its activities are cloaked in mystic secrecy, we know very little about the political apparatus of the Soviet Union. But we can guess that there are Soviet "hawks" and Soviet "doves." Diplomacy is still the art of international communication and persuasion; a very important part of it is the dissipating of the hard issues of world affairs with the solvent of reason. Soviet military leaders may be unaware of the risks they take in seeking to occupy, or to pre-empt, the next rung of the nuclear ladder. It will be the task of Free World diplomacy to strengthen the hands of those in the Soviet Union who find the risks involved unacceptable, and who recognize that, whatever their ideological differences with the United States, there is nothing to be gained by courting the destruction of the planet upon which we dwell.

In other areas we find depreciating security. In no region is the peace more fragile than in the Middle East. Here again, we have particular doubts about the effects of Soviet policy.

The Tripartite Agreement of 1950 was the last attempt, by three Western powers, Britain, France and the United States, to provide security for the Middle East. Today a

precarious balance exists between Israel and those Arab states who recognize the futility of arms struggle on the one hand, and a relentless irredentism on the other.

Some fatuously contend there is an identity of views between ourselves and the Soviet Union, that both nations would act to prevent a major war in the Middle East. Yet, the leaders of Syria, who can find competition in irrationalism of their policies only from the Red Chinese, must be counted as minions of the Communist world.

In any major clash of interests, the world's peacekeeping arrangements would be closely limited. The U.N. has for nearly two decades maintained truce supervisory activities along the border of Israel and of her neighboring countries. A small U.N. security force remains in the Gaza Strip. With substantial American assistance a U.N. relief and work agency (UNRWA) continues to feed thousands of refugees whom the Arab nations have not absorbed. Like the refugee problems, many of the issues remain unsolved or insoluble. The U.N.-sponsored Armistice Commissions were not able to convene on the critical problems of the Syria-Israel border for a period of eight years.

The weakness of the United Nations is a reflection of the disunity among the world leaders. Without a firm Soviet commitment to peace in the Middle East, no taming of Syrian, or Egyptian, recalcitrance seems possible. Without good will on both sides, no peacekeeping organization can succeed.

We have witnessed in the raids of the renegade Palestine Liberation Organization what can only be called an attempt by one group of countries to egg another to attack a third. I refer to Syrian and Egyptian support of the Palestine Liberation Organization's attempt to bring Jordan into war with Israel. Such a parlay should be soundly condemned under the title of "Third Country Aggression." No nation on earth is safe as long as its neighbors may be used by a more distant adversary as a means of making war without suffering any consequences of its own.

This kind of attempt to embroil one nation against another is not new. We saw it when North Korea was encouraged by the Soviet Union to attack South Korea in 1950. We saw it in Cuba with the arrival of Soviet missiles and their supporting ground crews. We see it today in Africa where Tanzanian territory has been used to train "volunteers" to attack Mozambique. It occurred in Ghana, before the fall of Nkrumah, where Soviet and Chinese instructors taught guerrilla tactics to those who would subvert free nations in Africa.

Any nation which values its independence, regardless of its ideology, must see that such behavior is symptomatic of international anarchy.

"Third Country Aggression" is an ugly practice, which ought decisively to be condemned. I am sure that if a roll call were taken among the independent nations of this earth there would be no doubt of the result. Such strategy would be condemned.

Even our own government has indirectly been providing aid and assistance to the Palestine Liberation Organization through the feeding of Palestine refugees by the United Nations Relief and Work Agency. Sixty percent of the support of this body comes from the United States.

Last August, I asked the Secretary of State to determine whether United States aid funds were being disbursed in a manner that would benefit members of the Palestine Liberation Organization who were registered on the refugee roles. The Secretary answered—not as satisfactorily as I'd want. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 was later amended to make clear the intent of the Congress that American tax revenues would not support those being trained to attack Israel, or any other peaceful country. I recognize the great complication of reducing food rations

to hundreds of thousands of people, who have yet to find a livelihood after a war concluded nearly 20 years ago. But the arrangement made by which American funds were segregated still leaves the U.N. contributing to refugees who are members of the PLO. I simply say that if the United Nations is to have any authority on earth it must take firm steps to insure that it is not itself contributing to aggression.

We must take decisive steps in the United Nations to see that no further assistance is given to the Palestine Liberation Organization and that nations which indulge in egging one neighbor to attack another should be condemned out of hand.

In the absence of an effective international system for the maintenance of peace, the world is left to cope with its problem as best it can. We seek a rule of law in the world, but more exists. Force and physical power remain supreme. The burden falls unequally on the strong and on the willing. History has taught us some sober lessons. In the absence of a sound collective security system the first answer to territorial expansionism must be a determined defense. Today in Southeast Asia, with the aid of the large majority of nations free of Communist domination, the United States has once again committed itself to the principle that aggression must not be allowed to pay.

Robert Sherod, the well-known journalist and foreign correspondent, recently summed up a pessimistic article on Vietnam with the following thought:

"We have committed our national honor to defend our policy and our allies. The key question is the one asked so often by (President) Lyndon Johnson, 'What would you do?' At this point it makes no sense to say 'Give up,' or to ask 'Why did you do what you did?'" The United States and her allies have the ability to see the problem through. I believe that through sound programs of political and economic development, the people of Vietnam may be able to determine freely and for themselves what their destiny will be. The achievement of this right to choose is our goal.

The people of South Vietnam went to the polls last fall to elect a Constituent Assembly. That election was a clear example of the use of the techniques of democracy in a war which involves men's minds more than their geography. The vote which the people of Vietnam cast, despite the intensified campaign of terror carried on by the Communist Viet Cong, displayed yet again the tremendous wager on the system of self-government which the Vietnamese have undertaken.

The Vietnamese Constituent Assembly is now completing its labors. By the spring of this year a Constitution will be promulgated. The villages and the hamlets are again scheduled to test the democratic process in the election of local chieftains. In the village the tradition of elections runs deep into Vietnamese history. By the end of the year national elections are planned to elect a President and possibly a new Assembly. These would be major gains. But no such progress would be possible without resolute opposition to Communist terror and aggression.

The political growth in Vietnam is a hopeful aspect of a costly and ugly war. This conflict has plagued the hearts of our allies with doubts, has permitted the Cassandras of Europe to sow disaffection in the NATO Alliance.

Twice in our lifetime America has been called by its allies beyond the seas to fight for the freedom of Europe. More recently, we have been called to the aid of our allies in Asia. We live in an interdependent world. The United States cannot play the role of Atlas. We cannot be the world's policeman. If independent nations are to remain free, they must recognize the facts of interdependence and adhere to the principles of collective security.

Last year, a spokesman for the French Government said "International crises no longer center in Europe, but in Asia, and the majority of NATO countries are not involved in Asia." And thus he argued that Western Europe should be unconcerned with our exertions in Indochina.

One of the problems of Atlas was the pathos of being alone. Many in Europe seem to be fascinated with the painful ordeal our nation is going through. Yet the consequences of the United States laying down her burden are as great for the people of Europe as for the people of Vietnam.

Europeans must know full well that a nation's acquiescence points to her own destruction. The concept of collective security is founded on the idea that aggression, by whatever name, must not be tolerated in the community of nation states. Where it is resisted, hope remains.

I do not hold with those who feel there is something morally wrong with the United States because she has accepted the challenges of the Communists' misnamed "Wars of National Liberation." Those who entertain such doubts would have Atlas cast off his burden and let the earth come crashing to the ground. That is not a realistic choice for free men.

Rather the course lies for us to persevere and recruit new members to the cause of collective security, to make full use of the channels of diplomacy to use America's great creative powers in seeking new instrumentalities for preserving the security of this earth—to let no one doubt that time is on the side of rational men and women, however great their burden may be.

THE BATTLE FOR CLEAN AIR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the "Battle for Clean Air" has become a matter of concern for the entire Nation. Our very existence is dependent on the environment that surrounds our world, an environment slowly being poisoned by pollution. For too long we have tolerated filth in the air. For too long we have ignored the dangers of contamination. Our complacency was born from ignorance and from the hope that the dangers could be somehow controlled by a brisk wind. But no wind has been strong enough to remove the tremendous amounts of pollution deposits that a modern, industrial society has itself placed in the air. And these uncontrolled hydrocarbons, oxides, and noxious odors will continue to multiply until this same society can mobilize its every resource against the threat it has created.

This mobilization is in progress today but only to a limited extent. As the author of the first proposal to provide grants-in-aid for research and technical assistance in the air pollution area, I have followed with great interest the developing efforts of local, State and Federal governments in attempting to control environmental contamination. But the hazards continue to increase; hazards which demand greater and intensified action by Government, by industry; indeed, by every citizen. I believe the Nation can and will respond to the menacing challenge of air pollution, much as it has responded to similar challenges in transportation, communication, national defense, and space exploration.

Legislation has been introduced in the Congress to provide for greater research, additional assistance, and added tax incentives. Only recently, the Subcommittee

on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works held hearings in Los Angeles to study the effectiveness of auto emission devices. I was pleased at that time to present a statement before the subcommittee on the need for effective Government-industry cooperation in the battle for clean air.

Of particular interest and satisfaction to me are the recent efforts in my own State of California to control pollution. Our distinguished Gov. Ronald Reagan, has submitted a waste management program to the State legislature which is aimed at controlling pollution not only of the air, but of water and land. The proposal establishes single State governmental units in each of these fields, recommends tough antipollution standards, and calls for the creation of an environmental quality board to provide a unified approach to solving the problems of pollution control. Perhaps Governor Reagan's own words best summarize the need for greater national concern and action in the battle for clean air:

If the air cannot be breathed, if the water is unfit for drinking, if the land is despoiled by our own refuse, we will have nothing. If we permit the befouling of our air, our water, our land, we shortly will be unable to live in this great state.

These views are in line with my own. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Governor Reagan in sending to the California Legislature his proposal for a California waste management program be placed in the RECORD at this point. I further ask unanimous consent that the statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution also be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR REAGAN ON THE CALIFORNIA WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

To the Senate and Assembly of the Legislature of California:

I am today submitting a proposal for a California Waste Management Program designed to end the pollution of our air, water and land. Such pollution is a major threat to public health, economic growth and the quality of our California environment.

Specific legislation will be introduced within the next few weeks which will make California the first state in the nation to adopt a comprehensive three-fold approach to the very critical problems of pollution.

As you are aware, there are serious gaps in state policy and a piecemeal fragmentation of governmental units which now characterize the waste management field. There is an absence of state policy goals aimed at improving the quality of our environment. And there is little ability now to control the major sources of pollution.

We must adopt a systematic program of action in this field. To meet this need, we are proposing a policy that would:

1. Reorganize and consolidate the existing fragmented government systems by establishing single state governmental units in the fields of air resources, water resources and solid waste disposal. I cannot emphasize too strongly, however, that this consolidation must preserve local responsibilities.
2. Establish tough anti-pollution standards, especially in the field of air pollution.
3. Recognize that the related problems

of air pollution, water pollution and solid waste disposal are part of the general problem of protecting the quality of California's environment.

I am, therefore, recommending legislation establishing a single Air Resources Board. This Board would have jurisdiction not only in the field of motor vehicle emissions now covered by law, but also over air pollution from stationary sources such as open burning, burning dumps and industrial-commercial operations.

This legislation would authorize the Air Resources Board to adopt standards governing the composition of diesel and other motor fuels and would establish a statewide air monitoring system. Educational efforts on the very serious problems of air pollution would be stepped up.

In addition, a major requirement in the field of air pollution should be a provision that vehicle emission devices be designed to meet 1970 standards. This would give the automotive industry and others a three-year period in which to develop and improve emission devices that would meet a definite and minimum goal set for 1970.

Until now, limited responsibilities for air pollution control have been vested at all levels of government. The result has been an inability to develop a program that considers the total air pollution burden on the air resources throughout a region.

I am further recommending that legislation be enacted to establish a single unit of state government for liquid waste management. Responsibility for water quality control, according to a report by the "Little Hoover Commission," is diffused among the State Water Quality Control Board, nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards, the Department of Water Resources, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Fish and Game and waste discharges under self-monitoring arrangements.

The Assembly Water Committee, headed by Assemblyman Carley Porter, has recommended merging the State Water Rights and Water Quality Control Boards and I look with approval on this measure.

Finally, legislation should be enacted which would designate responsibility within the Department of Public Health for developing solid waste management policies and standards and for undertaking research and development. In this field of refuse and sanitation, no state agency now has the statutory responsibility for planning and development of standards.

I would also suggest that legislation creating a California Waste Management Act of 1967 be enacted, establishing an Environmental Quality Board to provide a unified approach to solving the problems of pollution control and improving the quality of our environment.

Such a Board would resolve policy conflicts between air, water and solid waste disposal agencies and would make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature to prevent pollution. Representatives on the Board might include those from the agencies in the water, air and solid waste fields. Other members could be representatives of the League of Cities, County Supervisors Assn., State Planning Office, the Legislature and the state Chamber of Commerce.

Such a Board, involving all segments of the population, would allow the needed flexibility necessary to implement pollution controls on the local and regional levels.

What I have outlined today will have a very limited immediate cost but will result in significantly improved programs for making our environment livable. As state responsibility broadens, and this unique approach results in a cleaner and better California, costs will increase. But federal grants can be expected in the future to finance this tremendously improved and vitally important program.

This "Waste Management Program" provides California with the opportunity to

pioneer among all the states of this nation in the waste management field.

California cannot afford to lose its three most valuable resources. If the air cannot be breathed, if the water is unfit for drinking, if the land is despoiled by our own refuse, we will have nothing. If we permit the befouling of our air, our water, our land, we shortly will be unable to live in this great state.

I am thoroughly convinced that we must act—and act now. At best, our current efforts are barely keeping even with the problem. Much greater effort must be put forth. Enactment of this program is the first step toward a brighter future.

INDUSTRY'S ROLE IN THE BATTLE FOR CLEAN AIR
(Statement by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, February 13, 1967)

In the 1930's, the people of Los Angeles County, numbering in those days a little over two million, became aware that their matchless climate was blemished somewhat by a periodic haze. No one had heard of hydrocarbons or smog. No one spoke of sulphur oxides, oxidants, particulates, and oxides of nitrogen. Many blamed the newly constructed oil refineries for the noxious odors in the air. In the valleys, after a night of low temperatures and heavy smudge pot burning, a pall of soot which literally blacked out the sun enveloped the small country towns. Complaints were often heard but little action was taken. The oil industry, at one point, felt obliged to employ a technical inspector who was charged with the duty of keeping a 24-hour surveillance of the refineries and had the authority to enter the refinery premises and halt any operation producing an odor nuisance. In general, however, people in those days largely were tolerant of pollution in the air. They were ignorant of the hidden dangers and hopeful that at worst the haze would last no more than a day or two.

The County of Los Angeles, the State of California, indeed, the entire Nation, have come a long way since the days of aggravating haze and technical inspectors. Today, the problem of air pollution is referred to in terms of a national crisis. Science has deduced that the pollutants in the air strike at virtually everything that exists. In economic losses alone, air pollution costs the country billions of dollars a year through injury to vegetation and livestock, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, depression of property values, and interference with ground and air transportation. Of even greater significance are the adverse effects on human health. Pollution has been related to a growing number of ailments—asthma, bronchitis, lung cancer and emphysema. The Surgeon General's office has indicated that:

"In the not-too-distant future, if present rates of national growth are sustained, air pollution will reach truly critical proportions."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare states:

"What is already known about the relationship of air pollution to illness, disability, and premature death, together with considerations of prudence in the protection of public health, leave no doubt that the contemporary air pollution problem is a threat to the lives and health of millions of people in all parts of the country."

Local, State and Federal governments have been trying desperately to wage the battle for clean air. The efforts of Los Angeles County alone have been cited by the United States Public Health Service as a model for the Nation. The County Air Pollution District has initiated a number of attacks against open burning, industrial contamination, as well as automobile emissions.

The State of California was one of the first to grant local jurisdictions the authority

to regulate factories and other sources of atmospheric contamination through the establishment of air pollution control districts. In 1959, the State legislature directed the State Department of Public Health to establish standards for the air and created a Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board to test and, if necessary, require control devices; devices which in fact are today required on all cars sold in California.

On the Federal level, an identifiable program in air pollution was not established until 1955, when Public Law 159 was passed by the 84th Congress. As a member of the Public Works Committee at that time, I was the author of this proposal to provide the first grants-in-aid for research and technical assistance in this area. The adoption of the Clean Air Act in December of 1963 and the amendments that have been adopted since that date, have given the Federal Government a mandate to provide leadership and assistance in the national effort to control pollution.

But despite the public and private efforts in this area, despite the volumes of research and the thousands of dollars of assistance, despite the controls that have been established, and the standards that have been developed, air pollution continues to grow and to threaten the environment of our Nation. The recent clouds of pollution that settled on New York are but one example. Recent reports from the County of Los Angeles raise serious questions regarding the effectiveness of control devices on automobiles. Statistics on the damaging effects of smog on health and property continue to multiply.

As the hazards increase, the Nation gropes for any answer, any solution, but the same are offered again and again—more legislation, more controls, more research and more assistance. The Administration has recommended greater Federal controls. This recommendation, of course, should be studied. My own view is that if police power is to be invoked in the area of air pollution, it ought primarily to rest with the individual states of the Union. I should not wish to invoke Federal police power until it indisputably is shown that there is no other alternative. That constitutes one of the basic responsibilities of this Subcommittee.

Legislation also has been introduced in the Congress again to provide for greater research, additional assistance to local programs, and added tax incentives for industries building pollution abatement facilities. Though all of these proposals certainly will have some effect on the air pollution problem, I am afraid that the same old answers will reap only the same results; results which have fallen seriously short of success; results which have offered only a slow, prodding, fragmented approach to a rapidly exploding environmental problem.

What is needed to meet this challenge to human environment is an attack equal to the threat. What is needed is not more controls but better technology, not the power of compulsion, but the power of industry, not more piece-meal research, but a well planned academic and industrial effort, not just additional tax incentives but real financial and competitive inducements.

The time has arrived for an enlightened overview of the problems of the human environment and of measures and plans for solution of these problems, both immediate and long range. And the primary key lies in the vast, unexploited resources of American industry and free enterprise. The ill effects of environmental hazards can be controlled effectively only through the development and application of technology. And it is only private industry that can undertake the kind of research and development which will lead to the technical hardware that can control, eliminate or modify environmental hazards.

In the battle for clean air, government

must induce the participation of industries with the greatest research and development capability. The solution of present and future environmental problems will have to be generated out of a collaboration between government and industry the equal of which may be unprecedented, but the pattern for which is neither new nor controversial.

The Federal Government has often successfully brought American industry into a partnership for the exploitation of new opportunities and the solution of problems. More than a century ago, the Federal Government and industry joined forces in an effort to forge the greatest network of railroads in the world. By somewhat different means, but with a parallel objective, the Federal Government has nurtured the resources of industry to develop air and highway transportation, electronic communications, publishing, and, of course, the industries heavily engaged in national defense and space exploration.

Behind each of these joint endeavors has been an acceptance of the premise that neither industry nor government alone has the capability of grasping an opportunity for vast economic development or for meeting a challenge to the national security or welfare. Furthermore, such collaborative efforts have always been predicated on the basic assumption—which can hardly be disputed—that the end product or goal, whether it be an efficient transportation system, colonization of the moon, or eradication of poliomyelitis, would help to preserve or strengthen society, or avert a crisis.

The Nation now faces a situation which more than any other in our history requires that we apply the technique of joint government-industry collaboration to preserve and protect society in order to avert a crisis of unimaginable proportions.

Environmental hazards to health are intimately linked to the growth of our industrial, technological society. This factor alone would seem to indicate that American industry must play a major part in solving environmental problems. But the resources of industry will have to be brought to bear on environmental problems for another, and perhaps more compelling, reason: without the application of the vast research and development capability of American industry, without its unequalled skill at identification and resolution of technological problems, the efforts of government to deal with present and future health hazards in the environment of man will continue to be substantially unsuccessful.

I believe it is fair to say that when this is pointed out to industrial leaders, they accept it. It is also fair to say that, given the proper incentives, industrial leaders are willing to apply the resources at their disposal to the solution of environmental problems. But they want to make this effort within the context of their place in the free enterprise system. In other words, industrial cooperation in the control of environmental pollution and in the design and maintenance of environments free of hazards to health and welfare will have to be consistent with the economic goals of our industrial system. This, in effect, means that government cannot expect to encourage great expansion in industrial research and development if industry will be effectively blocked from realizing a profit from its efforts.

The experience of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in drawing on the resources of private industry for research and development hardly needs to be discussed here, other than to point out that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has very similar needs but has yet to develop similar means of satisfying them. The Department has no Rand Corporation, no North American Aviation, nor any other private industry partner which recognizes a community of interest with the Departmental program. As a consequence, the Department has no effective

means of drawing on the resources of the private industrial community for basic research on environmental problems, for design of systems capable of meeting these problems, nor for development of hardware, where hardware is called for. It lacks the funds to support such an undertaking, but more importantly, it lacks the administrative structure and legislative authority to make such an undertaking possible.

I believe American industry is poised for a fundamentally new and immeasurably greater attack on problems of the human environment than has heretofore occurred. For the present, this industrial capability is largely untapped. It has been goaded to a limited extent by the expediency of regulatory control, but this means of Federal inducement has accomplished but a small fraction of the results that might be achieved through a more imaginative and resourceful Federal effort.

The problems faced by the government in meeting the growing challenge of air pollution are easy to describe. Conditions needing correction are easy to identify. A generalization on solutions is simple to state. These I have done. The difficult task is to identify all the barriers to effective cooperation between government and industry and to determine how these barriers can be breached. I am hopeful that this Subcommittee will give urgent consideration to this challenge. This is, in fact, the first order of business to which both industry and government must address themselves if industry is to have a role in the battle for clean air and, indeed, if the battle itself is ever to be won.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am glad to report that sundry newspapers in California have editorially commented on the position which Governor Reagan has taken in California and the position which I have taken here in Washington on the same subject. I ask unanimous consent that editorials from several California newspapers on the subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Berkeley (Calif.) Daily Gazette, Feb. 21, 1967]

SMOG CAN BE BEATEN, AND KUCHEL HAS ONE OF THE KEYS

In the fight against smog, the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District and private industry have cooperated in cleaning up the urban environment.

After extensive public hearings, the BAAPCD in recent years has promulgated regulations to control emissions of air pollutants from industrial sources. For its part, industry has invested considerable sums in equipment and technical research to meet those regulations.

In a statement to the Senate's subcommittee on air and water pollution, Senator Thomas H. Kuchel of California has called for effective nationwide government-industry cooperation in meeting the menacing challenge of air pollution.

The assistant minority leader told the subcommittee at a field meeting in Los Angeles:

"Without the application of the vast research and development capability of American industry, without its unequalled skill at identification and resolution of technological problems, the efforts of government to deal with present and future health hazards in the environment of man will continue to be substantially unsuccessful."

The subcommittee—and the nation—would do well to heed Senator Kuchel's remarks.

For the senator's home state has demonstrated how government can cooperate with private industry in the fight against a major health menace.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury Feb. 20, 1967]

POLLUTION WAR AIMS

Californians on the state and federal levels sought last week to mobilize the resources of society against the rising tide of pollution—of air, water and land.

In Washington, Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel (R-Calif.), assistant GOP leader of the Senate, called for greater industry-government cooperation in controlling air pollution. Kuchel was concerned primarily with the basic research and technology that must underpin any successful fight against smog.

In Sacramento, Gov. Ronald Reagan called for a coordinated attack on dirty air, polluted waters and waste-strewn land. Essentially, the governor sought to strengthen enforcement of existing regulations and to draft new and more effective controls as well.

In a sense, this approach represents an excellent division of labor between state and federal governments; it carries forward the basic philosophy developed more than a decade ago when Congress first began to appropriate money for research into the causes of smog.

It was agreed at that time that the federal government could make its greatest contribution in the field of research, leaving enforcement to local authorities.

The words of Sen. Kuchel and Gov. Reagan echo this philosophy.

The Senator said in part:

"The federal government has nurtured the resources of industry to develop air and highway transportation, electronic communications, publishing, and, of course, the industries heavily engaged in national defense and space exploration. The solution of present and future environmental problems will have to be generated out of a collaboration between government and industry the equal of which may be unprecedented, but the pattern for which is neither new nor controversial...."

"Without the application of the vast research and development capability of American industry, without its unequalled skill at identification and resolution of technological problems, the efforts of government to deal with present and future health hazards in the environment of man will continue to be substantially unsuccessful."

To which Gov. Reagan added, in a lengthy anti-pollution message to the California Legislature:

"If the air cannot be breathed, if the water is unfit for drinking, if the land is despoiled by our own refuse, we will have nothing. If we permit the befouling of our air, our water, our land, we will shortly be unable to live in this great state...."

The point is well taken. If existing regulations against pollution go unenforced; if exemptions are granted willy-nilly; if research is allowed to lag, no amount of administrative reorganization will improve the environment one iota.

This must not be allowed to happen. The indications in Sacramento and in Washington are that it will not be allowed to happen.

MEDAL OF HONOR AWARD TO CAPT. HARVEY C. BARNUM, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to be present this morning at the Marine Barracks when the Congressional Medal of Honor was presented to Capt. Harvey C. Barnum, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, of Cheshire, Conn.

It was a most touching and moving ceremony. Captain Barnum's mother, father, and brother attended along with many other relatives and friends. Abbot Gerald of St. Anslem's College, Manchester, N.H., came to Washington to

proudly witness his former student receive this great honor.

Captain Barnum now belongs to the ranks of the few who have qualified for the highest this Nation bestows on its fighting men.

We respect and admire the courage and strength of character a person must possess to perform the deeds necessary to be considered for the Medal of Honor.

I share with Captain Barnum's family and friends the great pride they feel in his accomplishments. I also congratulate him, on behalf of all our citizens, for his brave actions which earned him this high honor.

I believe that Captain Barnum is far more representative of our young people than whose misdeeds we read about daily in our newspapers.

As Captain Barnum's actions in battle in Vietnam speak more eloquently than any words of mine, I ask permission to have the text of the citation awarding him the Medal of Honor inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to First Lieutenant Harvey C. Barnum, Jr., United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Forward Observer for Artillery, while attached to Company H, Second Battalion, Ninth Marines, Third Marine Division (Reinforced), in action against communist forces at Ky Phu in Quang Tin Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 18 December 1965. When the company was suddenly pinned down by a hail of extremely accurate enemy fire and was quickly separated from the remainder of the battalion by over five hundred meters of open and fire-swept ground, and casualties mounted rapidly, Lieutenant Barnum quickly made a hazardous reconnaissance of the area seeking targets for his artillery. Finding the rifle company commander mortally wounded and the radio operator killed, he, with complete disregard for his own safety, gave aid to the dying commander, then removed the radio from the dead operator and strapped it to himself. He immediately assumed command of the rifle company, and moving at once into the midst of the heavy fire, rallying and giving encouragement to all units, reorganized them to replace the loss of key personnel and led their attack on enemy positions from which deadly fire continued to come. His sound and swift decisions and his obvious calm served to stabilize the badly decimated unit and his gallant example as he stood exposed repeatedly to point out targets served as an inspiration to all. Provided with two armed helicopters, he moved fearlessly through enemy fire to control the air attack against the firmly entrenched enemy while skillfully directing one platoon in a successful counter attack on the key enemy positions. Having thus cleared a small area, he requested and directed the landing of two transport helicopters for the evacuation of the dead and wounded. He then assisted in the mopping up and final seizure of the battalion's objective. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct reflected great credit upon himself and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Services."

MICHIGAN'S GOVERNOR ROMNEY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Michigan ship of state has been cap-

tained well during the last 4 years by our exceedingly able and popular Governor, George Romney. On November 8, 1966, the people of Michigan resoundingly reaffirmed their approval of Governor Romney's leadership when they reelected him to a full 4-year term by the overwhelming margin of nearly 530,000 votes.

Not only has Governor Romney up-ridged a ship that was listing badly, but he has also brought new meaning to the concept of self-government and citizenship responsibility.

In two recent inaugural addresses delivered in Michigan, one at Lansing on January 2 and another at Marquette on February 4, Governor Romney eloquently set before the people of Michigan the record of his administration as well as an outline of its future goals.

Because I know that his inaugural addresses will be of general interest, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS, "A NEW GENERATION OF PROGRESS," GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 2, 1967

Reverend clergy, fellow oath takers, friends and citizens:

These are our goals.

We have sworn to uphold the laws and constitutions, and pledged to grapple boldly with the future with all the vigor and wisdom we possess.

We seek a Michigan where every individual is free to develop to his full capacity; where barriers of poverty, social injustice and discrimination, including those erected in the minds and hearts of men, have been torn down; where vocational training and higher education are within the reach of every child, and each is equally free to choose his path; where the skills and contributions of the people meet their economic needs; where quality housing, productive employment and equal opportunity are available to all.

We seek a Michigan in which all our people share in a good life—a better life than most of us have today—based on qualities of heart and mind and spirit, as well as on material well-being.

We seek thriving, well-planned cities with efficient, integrated governments; an end to urban blight and ugliness; a new transportation network, unmarred by congestion, frustration and delay; green parks and open spaces accenting and enlivening our communities; an unequalled abundance of fresh clean water for all its many uses, and pure air.

We seek a Michigan where heightened citizen respect for law strengthens the framework of stability and order within which opportunity and freedom flourish.

We seek a Michigan where citizens throughout our state can walk or ride the streets, by day or night, without fear of physical assault, property loss, or traffic tragedy.

We seek government directed by those who put the public trust above all personal considerations, and set a high example both of public morality and private conduct; and politics adhering to standards that make public service an honored and preferred pursuit.

We seek more enlightened activity by private enterprise and voluntary associations, and a rebirth of cooperation not only among all governmental levels but between government and private effort, to achieve the goals which none can reach alone.

We seek a Michigan where those who strive

to overcome handicaps or misfortune will receive personalized assistance in their area of need, whether mental, physical, material, social, cultural, or spiritual—assistance which is already within our available skill, time, and means to provide. Of course, Washington would have to let us use more efficiently more of our own means.

We seek the use of our expanded leisure time as an opportunity not merely for greater self-gratification, but for self-fulfillment through faith, knowledge, work, citizenship, brotherhood and service.

And most of all, we seek a renewal of the vitality and strength of family life and personal conduct, on which all else depends. For the strength of society is rooted in the strength, responsibility, and character of individual lives.

Michigan's accomplishments of the past 4 years have laid a stronger foundation for the achievement of these goals.

Together we have fought to strengthen the people's control of state and local self-government.

Together we have secured a modern constitution. The executive branch is more effective, the judicial branch stronger, and the legislative branch more representative.

Our actions have reflected the determination to treat every citizen with justice, impartiality, and equality before the law.

We have given equitable treatment to both workers and employers, and restored Michigan's reputation as a responsible and responsive state—a dynamic state—a good state in which to live, invest, work and play.

We have overcome past deficiencies and achieved new heights in education, health care, recreation, and other fields of public service.

We have worked closely with leaders and citizens in other states to strengthen the forces of self-government controlled by the people and responsive to their needs and aspirations.

And we have encouraged the active participation of self-reliant individuals, families, private institutions, economic organizations, and voluntary associations in solving their own problems and meeting pressing needs—Independent of governmental subsidy, regulation, and control.

Together we have passed through a period of preparation. The people have a new attitude about their state—a new involvement in its affairs—a new optimism for its future.

And I am confident that the people of Michigan—responsible individuals devoted to the common good—are able and ready to supply the sweat, sacrifice, and service required to reach our goals.

For the people have spoken, and this is what they said:

"We, the people—we are individuals. Treat us as individuals. Don't try to lump us into faceless special-interest categories.

"We refuse to be neatly packed and labeled into economic, religious, racial, or ethnic blocs to be used by political brokers. We will not be deceived by promises of group favoritism and special privilege. We're not for sale.

"Give us a government that serves us, not one that makes us dependent and stifles us—a government we can control, not one that manages our lives."

That's what the people said.

The people are awake. They see the futility of trying to meet tomorrow's complex human problems with yesterday's over-simplified governmental answers.

The people feel the stifling consequences of over-centralization, conformity, manipulated consensus, and arbitrary unchecked power, whether public or private.

The people recognize the limitations of efforts to improve the lives of men and their society by material means alone.

The people sense there is a better way to meet their needs and still preserve the expression and integrity of individual personality.

The way has been prepared. The foundation has been laid.

The time has come for Michigan to move ahead into a new generation of progress.

And a new generation of people is prepared to provide much of the driving faith, imagination, intelligence, and resolve that this new generation of progress will require.

More than half the people of Michigan are not yet 30 years of age. We have no greater resource—no more precious asset—than their energy and idealism.

Young people in increasing numbers are finding an unequalled creative channel for their idealism in voluntary service to their fellow men. We have ample evidence in their enthusiastic response to the Peace Corps and to our own student volunteer movement here in Michigan.

And politically, young voters are in the vanguard of the resurgence of public confidence in the capacity of state and local governments to do a job for the people and do it close to home, where the people can scrutinize more closely the conduct of officials and get involved themselves in shaping public programs and performing public tasks.

The faltering of over-centralization, the solid accomplishments of state governments in recent years, the expressed approval of the voters, and the confidence of youth will give self-government at the state and local level a second chance to prove its worth.

As a state, the most important question Michigan can ask is, "Are we ready to take full advantage of our second chance?"

For if we fail to use it, the people will have no choice but to turn back to distant federal power for the services that state, local, private, and voluntary effort can most effectively perform.

If that should happen, our lofty vision of tomorrow could crumble into dust. Our hopes for a new generation of progress would be crushed.

For a sound political, social, and economic structure cannot be built from the top down. It must be raised from the bottom up.

It must be founded on the rock of individual effort and responsibility. It must be shaped by the foundation of family life. It must rest on the sturdy joists, beams, and framework of state, local, and independent institutions.

On this Inauguration Day, I pledge unceasing effort to justify your confidence not only in your chosen leaders but in state government itself.

I pledge to offer additional specific proposals in the weeks and months ahead to advance us further toward our goals.

I pledge that we will not drift down the easy paths of least resistance.

I pledge to confront you and your representatives with the hard choices necessary if Michigan's bright promise is to be fulfilled.

I pledge to call upon the people of this state to heed the wise advice of Emerson: "What would you have? . . . Pay for it and take it . . . it is impossible to get anything without its price."

The price of personal joy and freedom through self-government and personal responsibility is always high; but I believe the people of Michigan will respond.

For the people's leaders can be the architects, but the people themselves must be the builders of Michigan's new generation of progress.

Its hallmarks: Recognition of the sanctity of each individual personality; wide-open doors for individual opportunity and self-fulfillment; respect for God, parents, home, and law; receptivity to the idealistic fervor of the young; readiness to sweat, sacrifice, and serve; and resolution to use not government alone, but all the tools at our command to build a better Michigan.

This is the path which will lead, with God's help, to the fulfillment of our goals. In the words of Winston Churchill: "Come, then, let us go forward together with our united strength."

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS, GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, MARQUETTE, FEBRUARY 4, 1967

It's great to be here in Marquette today, so we can get away from all that snow in Lansing!

This is the third time that the people of the Upper Peninsula have honored us with a second inauguration ceremony. Lenore, Helen, Bill, and I appreciate it deeply. And we're particularly delighted that something new has been added this year—your great Senator and Congressman, BOB GRIFFIN and PHIL RUPPE.

The Upper Peninsula inaugural is a happy new tradition. It has real significance. Its purpose is not to get the Upper Peninsula apart from the rest of Michigan, but to reassert the fundamental unity of our state and of its people.

We have taken the same oaths—to uphold the laws and constitutions and to serve the people—that we took five weeks ago in Lansing. And my inaugural message, whether in Lansing or Marquette, is fundamentally the same.

For as I said two years ago, at Iron Mountain-Kingsford, "By these ceremonies . . . all of us here are reaffirming the fact that Michigan is indivisible."

These are our goals for all of Michigan—for the people of both our great peninsulas.

We seek a Michigan where every individual is free to develop to his full capacity; where barriers of poverty, social injustice and discrimination, including those erected in the minds and hearts of men, have been torn down; where vocational training and higher education are within the reach of every child, and each is equally free to choose his path; where the skills and contributions of the people meet their economic needs; where quality housing, productive employment and equal opportunity are available to all.

We seek a Michigan in which all our people share a better life, based on qualities of heart and mind and spirit, as well as on material well-being.

We seek thriving, well-planned communities with efficient, integrated governments; an end to urban blight and ugliness; a new transportation network; green parks and open spaces; an unequalled abundance of fresh clean water for all its many uses, and pure air.

We seek a Michigan that is united physically and economically, free from artificial barriers between our two peninsulas. The present stifling tolls on the Mackinac Bridge must be removed.

We seek a Michigan where heightened citizen respect for law strengthens the framework of stability and order within which opportunity and freedom flourish.

We seek a Michigan where citizens can walk or ride the streets, by day or night, without fear of physical assault, property loss, or traffic tragedy.

We seek a Michigan where each individual who strives to overcome handicaps or misfortune will receive personalized assistance in his area of need, whether mental, physical, material, social, cultural, or spiritual.

We seek government directed by those who put the public trust above all personal considerations—officials whose personal example makes public service an honored and preferred pursuit.

We seek more enlightened activity by private enterprise and voluntary associations, and a rebirth of cooperation among all governmental levels and between government and private effort, to achieve the goals which none can reach alone.

And most of all, we seek a renewal of the vitality and strength of family life and per-

sonal conduct, on which all else depends. For the strength of society is rooted in the strength, responsibility, and character of individual lives.

Michigan's accomplishments of the past four years have laid a stronger foundation for the achievement of these goals.

And the people of the Upper Peninsula have shared in both the effort and the benefits.

The Upper Peninsula is one of America's last great physical frontiers. Its promising potential is becoming more and more a bright reality.

In four years, employment in the U.P. has increased seven per cent, while unemployment has declined 39 per cent. Utilities, businesses, and industries are expanding at record rates. Associations for voluntary action to lick local problems are gaining strength. And for two years in a row, the Upper Peninsula has been the home of the "Michigan Product of the Year."

In three years, state aid to Upper Peninsula schools increased 25 times faster than pupil enrollment.

Operating appropriations for your two fine state universities have more than doubled in four years.

The two community colleges in the Upper Peninsula, like those in the lower peninsula, are receiving about 50 per cent more state aid per pupil than four years ago.

Services for the mentally ill and retarded, including new community services programs, have been substantially increased.

Expanded conservation, highway, and tourist programs are developing the Upper Peninsula's natural resource and recreational potential.

And we have made progress toward removing the tolls on the Big Mac Bridge. Two years ago, I proposed the issuance of new bonds to refinance the Bridge at lower interest rates, thus permitting elimination of the tolls. Unfortunately, interest rates went up before the legislature acted. But we did secure stand-by legislation which can lead to reduction or elimination of the tolls when interest rates go down again.

Today, interest rates have begun to decline. As a result, the prospects for refinancing the Bridge are brighter now than at any time since the enabling legislation was passed.

Meanwhile, we are actively pursuing the possibility of removing the Bridge tolls through action by the newly-established Upper Great Lakes Economic Development Commission. This is a joint body representing Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and the federal government. Its objective is to foster the economic growth of the Upper Great Lakes Area—and in my opinion, no single governmental step would contribute more to the economic resurgence of the Upper Peninsula and the entire area than removal of the Mackinac Bridge tolls.

Yes, these last four years have been years of accomplishment for all of Michigan.

Together we have fought to strengthen the people's control of state and local self-government.

Together we have secured a modern constitution.

Our actions have reflected the determination to treat every citizen with justice, impartiality, and equality before the law.

We have given equitable treatment to both workers and employers, and restored Michigan's reputation as a responsible and responsive state—a dynamic state—a good state in which to live, invest, work and play.

We have overcome past deficiencies and achieved new heights in education, health care, recreation, and other fields of public service.

We have worked closely with leaders and citizens in other states to strengthen the forces of self-government controlled by the people and responsive to their needs and aspirations.

And we have encouraged the active par-

ticipation of self-reliant individuals, families, private institutions, economic organizations, and voluntary associations in solving their own problems and meeting pressing needs—Independent of governmental subsidy, regulation, and control.

Together we have passed through a period of preparation. The people have a new attitude about their state—a new involvement in its affairs—a new optimism for its future.

And I am confident that the people of Michigan—responsible individuals devoted to the common good—are able and ready to supply the sweat, sacrifice, and service required to reach our goals.

The people are awake. They see the futility of trying to meet tomorrow's complex human problems with yesterday's over-simplified governmental answers.

The people feel the stifling consequences of over-centralization, conformity, manipulated consensus, and arbitrary unchecked power, whether public or private.

The people sense there is a better way to meet their needs and still preserve the expression and integrity of individual personality.

The way has been prepared. The foundation has been laid.

The time has come for Michigan to move ahead into a new generation of progress.

And a new generation of people is prepared to provide much of the driving faith, imagination, intelligence, and resolve that this new generation of progress will require.

More than half the people of Michigan are not yet 30 years of age. We have no greater resource—no more precious asset—than their energy and idealism.

Young people in increasing numbers are finding an unequalled creative channel for their idealism in voluntary service to their fellow men.

And politically, young voters are in the vanguard of the resurgence of public confidence in the capacity of state and local governments to do a job for the people.

The faltering of over-centralization, the solid accomplishments of state governments in recent years, the expressed approval of the voters, and the confidence of youth will give self-government at the state and local level a second chance to prove its worth.

As a state, the most important question Michigan can ask is, "Are we ready to take full advantage of our second chance?"

On this Inauguration Day, I pledge to do everything in my power so that Michigan will be prepared to use this second chance fully and wisely.

I pledge unceasing effort to justify your confidence not only in your chosen leaders but in state government itself.

I pledge to confront you and your representatives with the hard choices necessary if Michigan's bright promise is to be fulfilled.

Our greatest single governmental challenge in the months ahead is to secure the financial future of state and local government in Michigan.

The job will be tough. But the need is inescapable.

Michigan must have tax reform, and tax action in this legislative session must come before spending action.

I have said before, and I say again: We will not spend more next year than we are willing to pay for in taxes.

The price of responsive and responsible state and local government is not cheap. Yet it is one of the greatest bargains ever offered, contrasted to the ultimate price of weak and ineffective government.

For if we fail—if we miff our second chance—the people will have no choice but to turn back to distant federal power for the services that state, local, private, and voluntary effort can most effectively perform.

If that should happen, our lofty vision of tomorrow could crumble into dust. Our hopes for a new generation of progress would be crushed.

For as I have said so many times before, a sound political, social, and economic structure cannot be built from the top down. It must be raised from the bottom up.

It must be founded on the rock of individual effort and responsibility. It must be shaped by the foundation of family life. It must rest on the sturdy joints, beams, and framework of state, local, and independent institutions.

The price of personal joy and freedom through self-government and personal responsibility is always high. But I believe the people of Michigan will respond.

For the people's leaders can be the architects, but the people themselves must be the builders of Michigan's new generation of progress.

In the words of Winston Churchill: "Come, then, let us go forward together with our united strength."

With our united strength we can together, with the help of God, build a new generation of progress.

DR. WOODLIEF THOMAS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I regret to advise the Senate that for personal reasons, Dr. Woodlief Thomas has decided to leave the committee staff, and February 28 will mark the close of Dr. Thomas' services to the Banking and Currency Committee as chief economist.

Dr. Thomas came with the committee in January 1965, after a very distinguished career with the Federal Reserve System, which began in 1920 and included service as Director of the Board's Division of Research and Statistics, Economist to the Federal Open Market Committee, and Adviser to the Board. Following this, Dr. Thomas spent 2 years in Chile conducting a study of Chile's capital market situation for the World Bank. One of the most noteworthy services performed by Dr. Thomas for the Banking and Currency Committee was the study of the balance-of-payments situation conducted in 1965 in the Subcommittee on International Finance under the chairmanship of the Senator from Maine [Senator MUSKIE]. Dr. Thomas' great knowledge of the subject and his familiarity with possible witnesses representing all points of view made it possible for him to set up outstanding hearings.

The Banking and Currency Committee has been privileged to have had the benefit of the knowledge, experience, and sound judgment of Dr. Thomas. We shall miss Dr. Thomas and we wish him and Mrs. Thomas well.

THE 50TH MILESTONE IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, in 1917, while a headline-catching conflict raged, President Woodrow Wilson quietly put his signature on the first bill providing for assistance to vocational education.

The Smith-Hughes Act was enacted, providing an annual grant of \$7.2 million to the States: \$3 million for agricultural training, \$3 million for trade, industrial, and home economics education, \$1 million for teacher training, and the rest for Federal costs of administering the act.

This was but a beginning, and the scope of this aid to vocational education has evolved with our economy, our changing work force, and a technology that is constantly emerging and growing in complexity.

So milestone after milestone has been added as our land has risen to the challenge. In 1946, the George-Barden Act authorized \$28.5 million to be divided among the same categories as provided for in the original act, with addition of education for distributive occupations.

In 1956, fishery trades and occupations were added to vocational categories of the George-Barden Act, while authorizing an annual appropriation of \$375,000 for vocational education in those trades and industries and in distributive occupations.

Also in 1956, the Health Amendments Act added title II, which specified practical nursing for inclusion under the act, with a \$5 million annual appropriation.

In 1958 the National Defense Education Act further amended the George-Barden Act by authorizing \$15 million annually to train highly skilled technicians.

In 1961, the Area Redevelopment Act provided for training or retraining of unemployed or underemployed persons in redevelopment areas.

In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act authorized a total of \$951 million for a 4-year program of training similar to that under ARA, but broader and not limited to redevelopment areas.

The Vocational Education Assistance Act of 1963 has been tailored so that it will continue to meet growing needs through its flexibility. All parts of this program now mesh well together.

So it seems vocational education has come of age. All these years it has quietly and with few headlines performed a vital function, training uncounted numbers of essential technicians who make our society run on a day-to-day basis.

Where would we be without their services? It is only now that we are coming to realize that not all of our students can attain or even desire a college education. But many of these students want a technical education, which will enable them to be earners of fine livings and taxpaying contributors to the welfare of their individual communities.

Mr. President, I am a devoted believer in the cause of vocational education, and am doing all that I can in my home State of New Mexico to aid our forward-looking educators in this field in making available to the youth of our State the finest in vocational education.

The potential dropout, dropout, underemployed, and person whose skills have been dated by advancing technology can all find hope in technical and vocational education.

It is not a flashy program. It does not start picket lines in progress. It functions quietly, almost anonymously. But it does more real good for more people than many other lavishly funded programs have done.

It creates taxpayers rather than destroys them.

DENTAL CARE FOR CHILDREN

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, among the 12 proposals constituting the President's 1967 message on America's children and youth, there appears one of especial interest on dental care for children. One of the President's specific recommendations is legislation to authorize a pilot program of dental care for children in areas of acute poverty.

Dental care is one of the most ignored areas in the field of child health today. I have heard dentists refer to it, with some justification, as the "stepchild" of this area.

The dental profession, to my knowledge, has long worked to remedy this situation. Its most recent action, taken by the American Dental Association in November of last year, was to adopt a dental health program for children that would pledge the appropriate private and public resources to a cooperative effort to solve this longstanding deficiency in our national life.

As far back as last April, President Johnson spoke publicly of his personal concern. His proposal in the message delivered on February 8 gives substance to his intentions. The continuing cooperation of the dental profession can, I know, be counted on. Indeed, the president of the American Dental Association, Dr. William A. Garrett of my home State of Georgia, has already issued a statement commending the President's action and pledging the profession to further consultation and cooperation.

In the near future, the President will be sending us the specifics of his proposal. I await them, as I know do all my colleagues, with great interest. I, too, am eager to work in common purpose to extend to poor children the scope and quality of dental care they need and deserve to have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Dr. William A. Garrett, of Atlanta, president of the American Dental Association, on the message to Congress on children and youth.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM A. GARRETT, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION, ON DENTAL CARE PROPOSAL MADE BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN HIS FEBRUARY 8 MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

The American Dental Association is pleased indeed at this expression of the President's intent to join with the dental profession in its efforts to do something substantial about the appalling rate of dental disease among needy children.

It is a problem that the dental profession has long recognized and fought to remedy. Our most recent action, taken in November of 1966, was to adopt a Dental Health Program for Children, which brings together, in a unified, cooperative effort, the resources of both the private and public sectors of the nation and provides a framework for constructive action now and in the future.

The section on dental health that appears in the President's Message on America's Children and Youth is not sufficiently detailed for me to be able to judge how closely the thinking of the Administration is to that of the profession. I am confident, however, that consultation will show large areas of

agreement and the Association stands ready to participate in such discussions at the earliest possible moment.

HIGHWAY FUNDING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased that Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd has announced a slight thaw in the freeze of Federal highway construction money. But for Pennsylvania this will mean very little relief in our hard-pressed highway program.

I am informed by Pennsylvania Highway Secretary Robert Bartlett that the Commonwealth had planned to defer \$37.4 million in Federal interstate highway projects—principally in the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh areas—as a result of the previously announced freeze. This was work scheduled through the first 6 months of 1967.

Fortunately, however, the administrations of Governors Scranton and Shafer did not allow highway building in Pennsylvania to come to a complete halt. Seizing the initiative, the Commonwealth pledged to use its own funds to finance entirely ABC primary, urban, and secondary construction—work for which Federal assistance would normally have been available on an even 50-50 basis. A total of \$42 million in State money now has been committed for ABC work for which Federal funding would otherwise have been obtainable.

This move, in turn, made it possible for Pennsylvania to realize the greatest return on its reduced Federal dollars by allocating this assistance to interstate highway construction exclusively. As a result, the Commonwealth had \$70 million for interstate highway projects—a figure far greater than it would have been if Pennsylvania had taken no action other than to wait for a Federal “hand-out.”

Some relief is now in sight with the announcement that Secretary Boyd is releasing \$175 million of the deferred funds. When you carve that up among 50 States, however, it leaves little enough for Pennsylvania. Our \$37.4 million deficit will largely remain.

Money from the Federal highway trust fund can be spent for no other purpose. Thus, in my opinion, the withholding of such funds is budget gimmickry designed to give a false impression that the Federal Government is fighting inflation. I look forward to a further acceleration of vital Federal highway programs.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have read the President's message on the District of Columbia with great interest. It depicts with clarity and precision the problems faced by our Nation's Capital City and provides a hard, reasoned program for overcoming them.

I was particularly encouraged to see that the President remains undaunted by the setbacks of the 89th Congress in achieving home rule. To my mind, District home rule, along with District representation, is fundamental to an effective attack on the problems outlined in the message. I do not know how any community can marshal its civic re-

sources with any real effectiveness except behind a responsible political leadership of its own choosing. By civic resources I mean much more than mere money. I mean a sense of civic identity, a pride of place that makes a man speak of “my city” in the same way that he speaks of “my home, my castle.”

How helpless the citizen of Washington must feel in the face of his city's problems. What recourse does he have against ineffective civic leadership?

However, even if we are not moved by this American anomaly of 800,000 politically voteless citizens in the midst of the center of the democratic world, simple considerations of government efficiency and economy must dictate support for the President's recommendations. The appointed commission form of municipal government is simply not designed for big city management in this day and age. Government by committee is too cumbersome to permit the flexible use of municipal resources required to meet the shifting conditions and problems of the modern city. Efforts to react quickly to civic crises are doubly doomed in Washington, for the committee governing it is, in turn, governed by two other committees. Whatever the conscientiousness and dedication of the Members of the House and Senate, they are occupied by many other problems of the Nation and the world and cannot give adequate attention to the affairs of the District. And whatever the leadership quality of the men who hold the thankless job of District Commissioners, they are hedged at every turn by the network of Federal statutes under which they must operate.

There can be no question of the need for home rule, whether on grounds of morality or management. The reorganization plan announced by the President is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step; it will be useful as an interim device to prepare the way for home rule, but it is no substitute for it. Home rule must come to Washington, and it will come.

HOSPITAL SUPPLIES FOR RIO GRANDE DO SUL, BRAZIL

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have on other occasions called attention to the relationship which has developed between the Indiana Partners of the Alliance and Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, working cooperatively with the Alliance for Progress. Last year, a number of Indiana hospitals agreed to donate more than \$100,000 worth of hospital supplies and equipment through the Indiana Partners of the Alliance to hospitals in Rio Grande do Sul.

Under the able leadership of Mr. James E. Nicholas, general manager of the Indiana Motor Truck Association, more than 11 tons of equipment were collected and transported, first to a central depot at Bakalar Air Force Base, then to New York City for shipment to Brazil. A number of trucking companies joined together in providing this transportation free of charge, delivering two large trailer loads of material to the eastern seaboard.

An article in the January 1967 issue of the Fifth Wheel, which is the official publication of the Indiana Motor Truck

Association, Inc., described the coordinated efforts which went into this operation. As a tribute to the unselfish service rendered by the Indiana Motor Truck Association and its member firms to the successful completion of this important project, I ask unanimous consent that this brief account be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. As the author, Robert Loy, pointed out, the “people of Rio Grande do Sul will have improved treatment in their hospitals, thanks in great part to the generosity of Indiana trucking people.” In addition, I wish to commend those public-spirited hospitals in Indiana which so generously contributed this equipment and supplies for our good neighbors to the south.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fifth Wheel, January 1967]

TRUCKERS GIVE “FREE RIDE” TO HOSPITAL SUPPLIES FOR SOUTH AMERICA

(By Robert Loy)

Indiana truckers again have demonstrated their public spirit by giving a free ride to much-needed hospital supplies for the people of South America.

This was a program begun half a year ago, interrupted by the Viet Nam war and finally concluded in early January.

Last June, several Indiana hospitals affiliated with the Indiana Hospital Association donated more than 11 tons of surplus equipment and supplies valued at over \$100,000 to hospitals in Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

The program was sponsored by the Indiana Partners of the Alliance, a private organization working in cooperation with the Alliance For Progress to aid the people of South America.

Rio Grande do Sul, one of the Brazilian states, is Indiana's “sister” state in this endeavor. Hospitals there are in great need of modern equipment.

When the equipment collection was made in June, the Indiana Motor Truck Association coordinated the transportation of it from several cities in Indiana to Bakalar Air Force Base near Columbus.

Trucking companies which provided free transportation included A. & H. Truck line, Clemans Truck Line, Commercial Motor Freight, Inc. of Indiana, Courier-Newsom Express, Crutcher Brothers, Renner's Express and McLean Trucking Co.

These companies, their personnel and equipment performed magnificently and delivered the equipment to Bakalar on schedule.

The Partners of the Alliance working with the U.S. Department of State arranged for transportation by ship for the equipment from New York.

This meant transportation would have to be provided from Bakalar to New York.

Again the Indiana Motor Truck Association stepped into the picture and four of its member companies volunteered to haul the equipment at no charge.

Eastern Express, Inc. and Spector Motor Freight System each made a trailer available at Indianapolis and these trailers were pulled to Bakalar to be loaded, and returned by Courier-Newsom power units.

In the meantime, Lovelace Truck Service brought a load of dental equipment to Indianapolis which had been stored in Terre Haute.

During the last week of December Eastern and Spector pulled their loaded trailers to New York from where the equipment was to leave by ocean freighter early in January.

There were 89 crates, cartons and pallets of the hospital materials weighing 23,292 pounds and occupying 2,020 cubic feet of space.

Included were such items as an iron lung, sterilizers, surgical instruments, surgical tables, beds, special treatment devices and an incubator.

Thus, the people of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil will have improved treatment facilities in their hospitals thanks in great part to the generosity of Indiana trucking people.

Even premature babies, who otherwise would not be able to make it, will be given a chance to live by the acquisition of that incubator.

By coincidence, the governor-elect of Rio Grande do Sul, Walter Peracchi Barcellos, who took office in January, was visiting in Indianapolis when the hospital equipment was being made ready for shipment to New York.

James E. Nicholas, general manager of the IMTA, arranged for the two loaded trailers to be brought to the new IMTA Building the day before Christmas and Sr. Barcellos was able to have a first-hand look at the equipment before it was shipped to his country.

A television crew from station WFBM, Indianapolis, which is making a documentary on the Partners of the Alliance program, shot some films while Sr. Barcellos was at the IMTA headquarters. Some of this film coverage was shown on a news broadcast the same night.

Sr. Barcellos, speaking through a translator, expressed his thanks to all concerned in making the gift of hospital supplies available to his people.

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on February 16, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY introduced three bills to help control crime and delinquency in this Nation.

S. 991 would establish Federal help in providing street lighting to prevent crime in local areas.

S. 992 would create a National Institute of Criminal Justice in the Justice Department to provide new research and new methods for the control and prevention of crime and delinquency.

And, S. 993 would create six regional Academies of Criminal Justice connected with institutions of higher learning for the study of crime control and the rehabilitation of offenders and for the development of professionally trained personnel in the correctional field.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I am fully aware of the value of these proposals.

As a member of our subcommittee, Senator KENNEDY is equally aware of the need for both specific and comprehensive measures to improve the administration of justice in this Nation and to get at the roots of the problem of criminal behavior.

The three bills he has introduced are well thought out proposals for effective action to improve our crime control methods and to improve the treatment and rehabilitation of offenders.

I commend Senator KENNEDY for introducing these bills.

I ask that these proposals be given prompt consideration by this entire body.

And I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor to each of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR RANDOLPH SUPPORTS HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—COMMENTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in his message on the District, President Johnson has urged the Congress to give District citizens a voice in the selection of their local officials.

I support the President's proposal.

We who live and work in our Nation's capital know that the problems of this metropolitan area reflect many of the difficulties that face other major cities across the country.

We are battling a rising crime rate, terrible traffic congestion, overcrowded schools, inadequate housing in poor neighborhoods, and the other acute problems we encounter as we try to cope with urban life in the 1960's.

An obstacle, of course, is that the residents of the District of Columbia must face these problems without redress from elected officials pledged to fulfill their obligations to the community.

I believe that the problems facing the District can be overcome, in part, when the people can elect officials directly responsive to the voter. This is the most basic proposition of our democratic life: that representative government expresses the aspirations of the electorate it represents.

The 89th Congress passed bills which voiced this principle, but there was no agreement by which to implement it. We in the 90th Congress should reach such an agreement.

The House and Senate Committees on the District of Columbia, and the District Commissioners have been performing commendably in trying to bring progress to the District.

But we know that the District Committee is one assignment that most members do avoid. I served for 7 years as the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee during 14 years of effort in the House of Representatives.

Congress is coping with the vast and complex problems of the Nation, and the District of Columbia does not receive the attention that it deserves.

The District Commissioners are able and dedicated administrators, but there is no substitute for elected officials whose tenure depends on their records, as judged by the citizens.

The President has urged us to reach agreement on home rule. I believe that justice and the cause of democratic government itself are inherent in the request.

I urge my colleagues to favorably consider the cause of home rule, and bring the tens of thousands of Americans who reside in the District of Columbia into the mainstream of our national life.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that

the Chair lay before the Senate the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 655) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

EXPANSION OF U.S. MILITARY OFFENSIVE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in connection with the pending supplemental authorization bill, when the votes are taken later in the week, I intend to bear in mind that some 600,000 of the finest young men in the United States are in southeast Asia. Unfortunately, they are fighting what has come to be an American war, in the worst place in the entire world where American soldiers could fight, and in a little area of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

Yet, I cannot in good conscience ignore the fact that these fine young men—incidentally, the best trained, the best equipped, and the most intelligent fighting men that any nation ever put on a field of combat at any time in the history of the world—are not there of their own choosing. They are there because they have been called on by their Commander in Chief to serve overseas. Of course, we want them equipped with the best of everything that can be provided.

During the time that I was in southeast Asia—in Thailand and South Vietnam—for a period of about 3 weeks, from September 28 to October 19, 1965, I visited every air base in South Vietnam and every area of South Vietnam. During that time I spoke with many officers and enlisted men. I ate at messes with them, sometimes at noon, sometimes at night. I took down the names and addresses of more than 200 Ohio GI's serving in that stinking, filthy, dangerous area of the world.

When I spoke with our GI's from Ohio, I always asked, "Have you any problems? Have you any shortages?" They had few, if any, problems. The morale was exceptionally high.

Let no one say that the activities of some demonstrators, beatniks, publicity seekers, or draft card burners affect those men at all. One after another said, "Oh, we don't pay any attention to those fellows." Truly, those fighting men are the cream of the crop. If the war

continues to expand, as apparently it is expanding, certainly the next 200,000 or the next 400,000 youngsters sent there cannot be superior to the boys already there. I hope they will be as good. They are all entitled to be cared for in the best possible manner while they are over there, because—and I want to make it crystal clear—they had no choice. They are in the Armed Forces. We are faced with the fact that our boys are there, and we must take care of them.

Mr. President, without a doubt, President Johnson is expanding the U.S. military offensive in South Vietnam and in what is called North Vietnam. Of course, historically, there are no such places as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. There never have been. The Geneva accords of 1954 specifically stated that the 17th parallel was to be a temporary demarcation line to separate the two areas into what were to be temporarily termed North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The delegates at the Geneva Convention agreed to establish a demilitarized, or neutral, zone 6 miles in width along the temporary demarcation line. This was supposed to be a neutral zone under the control of the International Control Commission, consisting of representatives from Poland, India, and Canada.

In the present expansion of the war, our heavy artillery is now being fired for the first time across the demilitarized, or neutral, zone.

In addition, as an important part of the offensive in North Vietnam, we Americans are now dropping mines in the rivers of North Vietnam, not to destroy large freighters from West Germany, Canada, Russia, Poland, Greece, and other nations that are trading with North Vietnam but to destroy, to blow up, sampans and small craft, regardless of whether such small boats are carrying munitions and military supplies or are loaded with children going to school or with Vietnamese families traveling on a family mission. In addition, our offensive in recent days has been accelerated by heavy firing from our warships off the coast of North Vietnam.

However, during recent months we have read nothing of any offensive by the ARVN forces. We have read of the acceleration of our offensive, but what has become, a neutral leader could ask, of the so-called friendly forces of South Vietnam? In other words, for weeks and weeks no mention has been made in any newspaper in the world, to my knowledge, of any offensive being carried on by the so-called South Vietnamese Army. Approximately 118,000 soldiers of the army of South Vietnam—I mean soldiers of the army of the Saigon junta of 10 generals who overthrew the civil government of Saigon in June 1965—deserted from the so-called South Vietnamese Army during 1966. Now the leaders of the Saigon junta apparently make no pretense that they are fighting the Vietcong.

This has become, it is sad to relate, an American land war. Apparently the aim of our offensive is to make North Vietnam uninhabitable by men, women, children, and even by the water buffalo,

which are so essential to enable farm families to exist.

In the south, American attack-and-destroy missions in the provinces to the north and west of Saigon, have been laying waste to the countryside. Wave after wave of B-52's have destroyed some 28 square miles no farther than 30 miles from Saigon. This destruction with magnesium bombs and with our artillery has been so tremendous that an American military spokesman said triumphantly that our attack looked like a Fourth of July celebration.

What it looked like to the people of four little villages within 30 miles of Saigon is something else. As one peasant woman said:

I was very poor in my village, but I did not mind that. I wanted to stay. First, the planes passed over our fields. My husband didn't know what to do. He stood up. They killed him. I wish I had stayed and been killed, too.

She and 6,000 other natives of those four villages so close to Saigon were evacuated by the American forces. Those who survived are now in refugee camps operated not by South Vietnamese armed forces or South Vietnamese officials, but by Americans.

One of the four villages, Ben Suc, was typical of the others. It is now a ghost town with graves. The gardens are unattended. Every hut in that little village has been destroyed.

This is an American offensive that will be bitterly remembered and spoken of in Asia 100 years from now.

RELEASE OF THREE AMERICAN CIVILIANS FROM SAIGON PRISON

Mr. President, I now advert to a very sad and distressing situation. Three American civilians were released from prison in Saigon last week, after the men had alleged that they and other Americans, who are still jailed had been sentenced by a corrupt Saigon court and had lived in terror of being murdered by bribe-hungry wardens. The three Americans who were released under what was purported to be a delayed lunar New Year amnesty, had each been sentenced to serve 5 years on charges of currency manipulation. Two of those released, and four Americans still in jail, stated in writing that they were imprisoned on technicalities and primarily for extortion purposes by the South Vietnamese. One of those still in prison, Merle V. Brown, is a resident of Worthington, Ohio.

Mr. President, I can understand something about this matter because I recall distinctly when I was in Saigon along with Senator Cannon of the Committee on Armed Services, I remember one morning we both interviewed the flamboyant Prime Minister Ky. Prime Minister Ky, although he is Prime Minister of South Vietnam, was born and reared in what is termed North Vietnam. He was serving in the French Colonial Army which was fighting the Vietnamese forces; in other words, he was fighting the forces of liberation back in 1954 when the French were trying to hold on to their lush Indochinese empire and were compelled to do so by force and violence. In the end, of course, they failed.

Prime Minister Ky was in the French forces as an air force pilot in training.

In June of 1965, he was appointed Prime Minister of the Saigon government by 10 generals who overthrew the civilian government. Who are those 10 generals? Nine of the 10 generals were from North Vietnam and served in the French Colonial Army trying to suppress the forces of the National Liberation Front in the war of liberation. The civilian government of Saigon was overthrown by these 10 generals, nine of whom we Americans, during our Revolution, would have termed "Tories" because they were fighting on the side of the colonial oppressors.

Mr. President, to return to our interview with Prime Minister Ky, he is a very flamboyant, overdressed, young man. He has been in power in Saigon since June of 1965. I assert that without the support of the American forces and without the support of our CIA, which helped put him in power at the outset, he could not remain in power in Saigon for more than 1 or 2 weeks.

Mr. President, the interview to which I refer took place on a Wednesday morning. In the course of our discussion, Prime Minister Ky said, "We arrested a merchant." He told us the man's name. Ky said he was a millionaire Chinese merchant and a leading businessman in Saigon.

On this particular Wednesday morning he said his police had arrested that man for black marketing and that he himself was going to try him on the charge of black marketing the next day, Thursday; and that they were going to shoot him the following Tuesday. It was all cut and dried. That is the kind of democratic prime minister we are supporting in South Vietnam.

Recently, these American prisoners smuggled out of prison a letter to the U.S. Ambassador, and to Prime Minister Ky.

It was subsequently learned that on February 8, U.S. mission employees went to the prison and warned the Americans not to "get involved in trying to expose corruption in the government"—referring to the Saigon government—"because it would do you no good."

Those already released from jail in Saigon are Louis J. Fraser from Massachusetts, Coy G. Bond from Colorado, and Leroy F. Freeden from California. Fraser had been in prison since late 1965; Freeden, since July 4, 1966; and Bond, since July 27, 1966. But in the prison in Saigon there is still being held a gentleman by the name of Merle V. Brown of Worthington, Ohio; Bernard Elmont of New York City, P. Leo Bennett of Florida, and W. K. Char of Honolulu.

Mr. President, I do not know the facts pertaining to these other men who were arrested other than they were civilians. I do know, however, about Merle Brown of Worthington, Ohio.

His wife stated last Sunday that at the time of the trial of her husband, two aids of the Saigon court—two civilian officials of the Ky government—told her an acquittal would cost \$10,000. She said she had only \$5,000 and offered

to pay that but had not turned it over to the court aids because she knew she could not raise the additional \$5,000. Mr. President, a lawyer friend of mine in Columbus has obtained a statement from Mrs. Brown which I have not yet seen. It may be that after receiving it, I shall read it in the Chamber later this week.

Mr. President, all of those men except Mr. Char from Honolulu, who is awaiting trial, were sentenced to minimum prison terms of 5 years, and were also assessed heavy fines by the special court set up allegedly to fight corruption—to fight corruption, yet court officials offered to free Merle Brown if his unfortunate wife could raise \$10,000.

The smuggled letter to the Ambassador from the seven Americans held in prison along with 3,000 Vietcong prisoners states that they had been on a hunger strike for almost a month because they had "nothing to lose," and that they were existing on coffee and sugar water. That letter was dated last January 30.

The letter also stated—

We are positively convinced that we have been imprisoned primarily for extortive purposes by corrupt South Vietnamese . . . not for crimes committed against the state. We have been arrested for either minor offenses, technicalities, and in some cases only by implication, but almost all of us have been asked to pay large bribes in order to obtain acquittal at trial or amnesty after conviction.

The letter further stated that—

The director of the Saigon prison of Prime Minister Ky reminded us that there are over 3,000 anti-American (Viet Cong) prisoners here who would murder us at the first opportunity. Due to the fact that we must leave our cells during the day, the director's threat to our lives is more than obvious.

That is just one indication of the kind of justice meted out by the Saigon government, which has United States wholehearted support.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. President, with the acceleration of the war in Vietnam, particularly the bombing of installations in North Vietnam, together with the fact that we have approximately 600,000 of the finest fighting men who have ever worn the uniform of our country in Vietnam, we hear statements regarding a declaration of war.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, as Representative at Large from Ohio, it was my duty to vote for a declaration of war against Germany and the Axis Powers and also a declaration of war against the Japanese Empire. I am not ashamed of those votes. I cast my vote to declare war on the Imperial Japanese Empire directly after the attack on us at Pearl Harbor, and I did not hesitate one moment to cast that vote. Of course, it is a sad thing to look back on it and have to remember that during my service in Congress I voted on more than one occasion to declare war.

The vote, then, was unanimous with one exception in the House of Representatives. It was unanimous in the Senate. It would not be unanimous in the Senate today were the Senate to be asked by our President to declare war on North Vietnam. In my humble opinion, it is

unlikely that such a request will come to the Senate, but if it does, I know that the junior Senator from Ohio would cast his vote against a declaration of war.

Then, following such a declaration, because undoubtedly a very large majority of the Senate would vote in favor of it, the junior Senator from Ohio would vote to supply our officers and men with all the equipment and support which they would require—and I would do that gladly.

I do not know what reason would be given for requesting a declaration of war, but I do know that when I first went to South Vietnam I had previously swallowed entirely the statements from the Pentagon and the propaganda that we read in our papers. Before I went there, I believed that all of the Vietcong were Communists; that they were infiltrators from the north.

In one of the first conversations I had with General Westmoreland—whom I admire as a great Army officer—he stated to me that the bulk of the VC fighting in the Mekong Delta, south and west of Saigon, were born and reared in the Mekong Delta. In other words, they were from South Vietnam.

The second officer in command, Gen. Richard Stilwell, told me very emphatically that 80 percent of the VC fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in that very territory. Yet this civil war has become an American war.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder if the Senator obtained any information as to approximately what percentage of Vietcong are Communists, what percentage can read and write, what percentage have studied Karl Marx, whether or not it is actually the case that all of the Vietcong who are killed there are Communists. We constantly read and hear that so many Communists were killed yesterday, for example. Did the Senator get any information in that respect?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to try to answer that question. I shall not name him, because I do not want him to be rebuked by some armchair general in the Pentagon, but a very high-ranking general in our Armed Forces in Vietnam, when I asked him that question, told me that very few officers and men, fighting us in Vietnam had ever heard of Karl Marx or knew who he was. That is answering one part of the question.

Obviously, North Vietnam is a Communist country. However, there is every indication that it may well be a nationalist Communist country.

Well, Tito's Yugoslavia is a nationalist Communist country, but it is a well recognized fact that it is not a satellite of the Soviet Union.

It has been said that if all of Vietnam could be neutralized, until there was a reunification which restored Vietnam to its correct historical status as one country, North Vietnam could remain a nationalist Communist country and South Vietnam could—it is hoped—be what it is not today—governed by those selected by democratic processes.

The other day, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,

General Gavin said we are confronted with a new situation. Instead of Red China being a nation that should be feared by the free nations of the world, it is itself involved in insurrection and is in deep internal turmoil and unrest because of factions fighting for control. Therefore, Ho Chi Minh today is in an excellent position to withstand pressure from the Chinese Communist regime. He is independent. After all, he was imprisoned, toward the end of World War II, in a Chinese dungeon for a year. Very definitely, he is not part and parcel of Chinese communism. The fact is that the boys and girls and men and women who are fighting in the VC forces are illiterate, ignorant people. They would not know what the communism of Karl Marx is. They have never heard of it. They know as much about Karl Marx as Prime Minister Ky knows about democracy.

On another subject, we hear much about the aggression from the North from supposedly knowledgeable men on our General Staff and from the Defense Department, including Secretary of Defense McNamara. I have heard estimates that 45,000 hard-core Communist soldiers from North Vietnam have infiltrated into South Vietnam and are fighting there.

The number of infiltrators has leveled off recently and there are fewer now. The fact is that our country, too, has brought into South Vietnam more than 53,000 men to add to the forces of the United States and of South Vietnam, if they have any armed forces in being there now.

Of these 53,000, approximately 48,000 are fine combat soldiers from the Republic of Korea. There are 2,000 non-combat engineers from the Philippine Republic. There are a few hundred soldiers from New Zealand, and a very few thousand from Australia.

To return to the approximately 50,000 soldiers from the Republic of Korea, they are fine fighting men. Their training has resulted from the outpouring of many millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money. I spent time in the Republic of Korea. I reviewed, together with Senator CANNON and others, the Tiger Division, just before it left for Vietnam on American ships.

During the American Revolution, Mr. President, Lord North, for King George III, made an arrangement with the Duke of Hesse-Cassel in Germany to furnish thousands of Hessian soldiers, and the British Government paid thousands of pounds to the Duke of Hesse-Cassel for those soldiers, and sent them over to the American Colonies to fight on the side of the British soldiers. We contemptuously termed those Hessian soldiers "mercenaries."

Today, the Pentagon says, "Oh, no, these Koreans are not mercenaries." However, it is true that our President has added \$150 million to the treasury of the Republic of South Korea. It is true that when President Marcos of the Philippines was in our country, we increased the allowance of aid to the Philippine Republic by \$50 million at one time and \$100 million another, and following that event, the Philippines sent

over the noncombat engineers. But it would be horrifying to the generals in the Pentagon were we to term them "mercenaries."

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee asked about the percentage of Vietcong who are Communists. Throughout their history the Vietnamese people had, over the centuries, repelled Chinese aggression time and time again. During World War II, Vietnam was taken over by the Japanese. Immediately after the war the Japanese withdrew. Almost immediately the forces of liberation and freedom erupted in Vietnam. The French tried to restore their colonial empire in Indochina. They failed. Only 12,000 Frenchmen surrendered at Dienbienphu, but France had been bled white, one might say, by the fighting. So, following the Geneva agreement—which we approved but which we did not sign—240,000 French soldiers were withdrawn from that lush Indo-Chinese empire, consisting of what are now termed Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam.

Following Dienbienphu, a Nationalist government was formed in North Vietnam under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh. They had no elections. Ninety percent of the population were illiterate peasants. They had been waging guerrilla warfare for a long time. So, Ho Chi Minh took over.

In the Geneva agreement, it was specifically provided that there would be an election in 1956—an election throughout both North and South Vietnam. General Eisenhower, in his reminiscences has stated that it was well understood that if such an election were held, Ho Chi Minh would have received 80 percent of the votes of the people of Vietnam, both north and south of the 17th parallel.

So, at our insistence the election was called off. Then the CIA brought Diem who was then living in this country and he was installed as President. He was not elected President, but he became President of the Saigon government, and ruled until 1963 when he was overthrown by a coup in which I am afraid the truth is—and it will come out in time—our military and our CIA participated.

Mr. President, yesterday on the television program "Meet the Press," I listened to Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was somewhat terrifying to me, as an American who in his earlier days, during World War II served for most of 37 months in the combat zones in north Africa and Italy—having been one of the most terrified soldiers in the Fifth Army at the Anzio beachhead—to hear the Chief of Staff of our Armed Forces discussing the foreign policy of our country and not military matters.

The Chief of Staff was asked: "Do you favor an extension of the test ban treaty?"

We entered into a limited nuclear test ban treaty with Great Britain, the Soviet Union and other nations. That treaty was patiently sought for by three American Presidents, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy. The treaty was finally achieved during the administration of

the late great President John F. Kennedy, due to his efforts and those of his Ambassador at Large, Averell Harriman. An extension of the limited nuclear test ban treaty is now being considered.

Mr. President, our military leaders should adhere to military matters and not try to shape the foreign policy of the United States.

I think that President Eisenhower in one of the final statements he made before leaving the Presidency was correct when he warned the Nation against the military and industrial complex endangering our liberty and our Constitution.

Mr. President, these are not being imperiled by a rag-tag group of perhaps as many as 8,000 despicable Communists in this country. Far more dangerous than that is the militarist-industrial complex against which President Eisenhower warned.

General Wheeler was asked: "Do you favor an extension of this limited nuclear ban treaty?" He replied: "No."

This, during a period of time in which our people in the State Department and other high administration officials are patiently trying to work out an extension of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Knowledgeable people know—of course, the militarists know, but do not seem to care—that in this grim period of international anarchy the time is at hand when the United States and the Soviet Union—the two most powerful nations on earth with the nuclear capacity to practically destroy each other—must realize that we are facing an era in which we should strive for coexistence. If we do not achieve coexistence, we will be confronted with coannihilation.

I take a dim view of a high-ranking general, such as General Wheeler, making the statements he made on "Meet the Press." The general was asked whether we could withdraw a sizable number of our Armed Forces from Western Europe where we have nearly 1 million men and their dependents, most of them in Germany.

Everyone knows that times have changed very considerably from the days of Stalin and Khrushchev. Every knowledgeable person in the world knows today that the Soviet Union is no longer a have-not nation. We know that the Soviet Union is a have nation and that its leaders are striving to improve the standard of living of their people. Western Europe is no longer seriously threatened with aggression from the Soviet Union.

It is obvious that the outflow of gold would be stopped and turned the other way if we were to bring some of our forces home or send them to southeast Asia, where they will be really needed if we are to continue to expand the war in Vietnam. Furthermore, our Operation Airlift has proven that we can transport and land in Europe within 36 hours and place in the field combat-ready divisions, fully equipped and ready to fight.

General Wheeler said he would have to explore the terms of the agreement to determine what would be necessary for the security of the United States.

That is a matter for the Congress of the United States to consider. It is a

matter for the President and for officials of the State Department. It is not a matter for the high moguls in our Army of determine. It involves the foreign policy of our country.

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, then stated:

I do not trust the Russians.

He then added:

If history is a test, we should not trust the Russians.

If General Wheeler is the intelligent man that I know he is, he knows that the Soviet Union has lived up in every particular to its obligations under the limited nuclear test ban treaty. We have entered into a treaty with the Soviet Union for the entire Antarctica region and our scientists are working in cooperation with those of the Soviet Union at the present time. Very definitely, General Wheeler was out of line in making those statements.

Mr. President, things have gone from bad to worse in North Vietnam since we have accelerated our bombing of that area. It is to be regretted that our Commander in Chief did not even wait until Premier Kosygin left London before ordering the resumption of the bombing.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 355) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 665, the military procurement authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 665) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

EXPANSION OF U.S. MILITARY OFFENSIVE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it has seemed to me that it was exceedingly ill timed not to afford an opportunity for Kosygin at least to return to his homeland and make a complete report before we resumed our bombing of North Vietnam. It has seemed to me,

as a humble Member of the Senate, that it was in bad taste and was offensive to Pope Paul VI, who is striving so hard to bring all parties concerned to a conference table. It was offensive, it seemed to me, to Security General U Thant, of the United Nations, who has been striving to have us abstain from the bombing of North Vietnam and thereby to provide further time for him to try to bring about negotiations.

In addition, we should have considered the turmoil and insurrection afflicting the huge Chinese Communist state, whose population of 750 million comprises one-fourth of the people of the entire world. With Communist China in chaotic condition, with turbulence, with fighting and killing going on there, it seems to me that now, as never before, would be the time for us to do everything possible to bring about a conference to see if a cease-fire or an armistice could not be established in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, it seems to me, some of the President's advisers manifest a lack of wisdom. I should like Secretary of State Rusk to answer without evasion one simple question. He has evaded it every time it has been asked. The question is: "Are you willing to agree that representatives of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam—in other words, the independent representatives of the Vietcong—may sit as independent delegates at a peace conference?" I do not want Secretary Rusk's evasive answer that they could be represented by delegates of the Hanoi Government, or that some arrangements could be made. Obviously there can be no peace or no cease-fire in South Vietnam unless the forces of the National Liberation Front are represented by independent delegates. It seems to me that in view of the unsettled conditions in Communist China, in view of the fact that Communist China and the Soviet Union have a common border of some 6,500 miles; that invectives are being hurled by the leaders in Peking at the leaders in Moscow; that the Chinese are moving their forces along the border; and that relations between Peking and Moscow are strained as never before; that now is the time for us to renew our efforts to bring about a conference that could possibly result in an armistice or a cease-fire.

By the way, what has our intensive bombing of North Vietnam accomplished? Many civilians—men, women, and children—have been killed or horribly burned or otherwise maimed. No doubt great damage has been inflicted upon North Vietnam, because more than half of our tremendous airpower is involved and committed there, despite our tremendous losses. Unfortunately, the Pentagon generals, in telling of the losses, were less than honest with Members of Congress when, in stating the numbers of planes that had been destroyed in combat, they did not include planes on the ground that were destroyed by ground fire. Despite the strong assaults by our tremendous airpower, one is reminded of the Luftwaffe's daily bombing of London and other parts of England day after day, night after night, in an attempt to destroy England.

Instead of accomplishing what Hitler thought he would accomplish—terrifying the English people so that they would sue for peace—the bombing not only did nothing of the sort, but strengthened the will of the English people and their government to resist. I am fearful that our intensive bombing has strengthened the will of the North Vietnamese to resist, thus making them appear heroic to a large segment of world opinion.

It should not surprise us that at present the rulers of Japan seem to be hostile to us. The Japanese people have been rioting against us in the streets. The people of India, who have been kept alive by our huge sums of money and grain, are hostile to us. We have few friends in Asia; and our European allies—certainly De Gaulle—are exceedingly unfriendly to us and are becoming more so.

Let us hope that the President will try again to halt the bombing of North Vietnam, if only for a week or 2 weeks, or until some definite date in the expectation that during that time a further effort will be made to restore peace, so that the Armed Forces of America can eventually be withdrawn from South Vietnam.

South Vietnam is a little area, probably less than half the size of the State of Nevada, a little larger than the State of Georgia, and one and one-half times the size of my State of Ohio; a little area 9,000 to 10,000 miles distance from our shores. It is not now, never was, and never will be of any strategic importance to the United States. Certainly, Saigon is not an outpost for the defense of Seattle.

The time is long past due when we should take a further look at the situation and, disregarding for the time being our militarists, give the greatest possible consideration to some 600,000 of the finest youth of America who are now in this jungle area. It is said that some 2,000 of our troops there have been afflicted with forms of bubonic plague and other plagues, some 800 or more every month are afflicted with malaria and other jungle diseases. In addition, hundreds of these fine boys are being killed every month and thousands are being wounded.

Mr. President, let us hope that there will be a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam, and that during that pause we will give renewed consideration to the welfare and the future of those fine young men who are over there. They are not over there of their own free will.

Mr. President, I expect to vote in support of the Clark amendment which is being considered to the supplemental authorization bill. I shall carefully consider all amendments. I hope that perhaps soon we can devote the billions of dollars now being spent on the Vietnam war to the betterment of life in America, rather than to fire \$2.4 billion up in smoke every month for no useful purpose whatever.

I want to support the supplemental authorization bill. In addition, I want, along with other Members of the Congress, to leave a better country to our children and our grandchildren who, within a comparatively few years—I will not be here, then—will be the custodians

and keepers of our country. I hope that we may have a pause in this bombing of North Vietnam so that we may give more serious consideration and concentration to the problem of trying to leave to those who come after us a nation that is solvent and mighty, with unlimited resources, and in a peaceful world; a nation where only minor attention will be paid to those militarists who are preaching blood and the destruction of a land 10,000 miles distant, which is of no importance whatever, to the economic future or to the strategic defense of the United States.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTROYA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGESTION IN THE PORT OF SAIGON

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a letter to the editor of the Baltimore Sun from William S. Gaud, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. In his letter Mr. Gaud presents the most complete explanation I have seen to date of both the dimensions of the problems of congestion in the port of Saigon and the steps that have been taken to deal with it.

As Mr. Gaud points out, the port of Saigon was designed to handle about 1.5 million tons of cargo a year. But it is, in fact, today handling cargo at an annual rate of about 5 million tons. The fact that its capacity has more than tripled speaks for the improvements that have been made. Obviously, still more needs to be done. In his letter Mr. Gaud specifies the measures that have been taken and the progress made. I commend it to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 12, 1967]
A LETTER TO THE EDITOR: PORT OF SAIGON:
AID STATEMENT

Sir: I have read Mrs. Helen Bentley's recent articles on the port of Saigon with a great interest and concern. Mrs. Bentley has vividly described the congestion and some of the problems which one encounters in the Saigon port area and in the staging area downstream.

I am disturbed, however, that the focus and emphasis of these articles will leave your readers with the quite erroneous impression that such conditions were not anticipated by the United States Government, and that nothing effective has been done, or is being done, to correct this situation.

In making the decision to make large commodity shipments to Vietnam, the United States Government fully recognized that serious congestion would inevitably occur in the port of Saigon. But what was the alternative? Heavy demands for a wide variety of commodities existed in Vietnam. Shore supplies were pushing prices upward. Serious inflation threatened Vietnam's sensitive economy.

The United States and Vietnamese governments determined that inflation was the greater threat—a decision which, in retrospect, was correct. This choice, coming on top of continuing heavy shipments of military supplies, meant that we would strain the capacity of the port of Saigon to the utmost.

However, knowing that we must strain the Saigon port facilities, we also set out to help Vietnam improve those facilities as fast as might be possible in the midst of a war. This effort has already produced significant results and is continuing.

The port of Saigon was designed to handle about 1.5 million tons of cargo a year. Prior to the beginning of the military and economic build-up in the summer of 1965, these facilities were adequate for Vietnam's needs. Today, however, the port is handling cargo at an annual rate of about 5 million tons. It is obvious, therefore, that something dramatic has happened to the port of Saigon in the relatively short period of a year and a half.

On November 26, 1965, there was a backlog of 122 vessels unloading or waiting to unload. On January 31, 1967, there were 69 vessels unloading or waiting. During November, 1965, 218,000 tons of cargo were discharged. During November, 1966, 415,000 tons were discharged. By November, 1967, the monthly discharge capacity of the port is expected to reach about 630,000 tons. Between mid-1965 and January, 1967, there has been a 50 per cent increase in the number of vessels which could be discharged simultaneously.

During the past year and a half, great improvements have been made in physical facilities, port management, cargo documentation and port security. While there are still many problems in all these areas, much has already been done, many things are being done now and many additional things are in the planning stage.

It takes time and trained manpower to design physical facilities, negotiate contracts and get work underway, even under "crash conditions." It takes time and trained manpower to design and install new management procedures and to improve port security. These things have been happening about as fast as possible under the conditions prevailing in Vietnam.

They have been happening fast enough to change the capacity of the port from 1.5 million tons to 5 million tons per year within a year and a half. As a result, the commodity import program has been effective as a key instrument in containing what would otherwise have been rampant inflation. Over 150,000 different commodities have been procured, shipped and distributed.

Some of the specific physical improvements to benefit the port of Saigon follow:

a. Fourteen additional deep-draft buoy sites have been prepared and a floating dock for roll-on-roll-off loading has been put into operation.

b. "New Port," an entire new section of the Saigon port, is partially constructed and in use by the United States military. It is scheduled for completion in the spring of 1967.

c. Expansion of barge unloading facilities on both the Kinh Te and Kinh Doi canals in Saigon will be completed within the near future.

d. A new deep water berth, the "Fish Market pier," south of the main port area, is now in operation.

e. A fresh-water facility for ships in port has been finished.

f. AID is building the largest warehouse complex in Vietnam, 676,000 square feet of new civil warehouse space at Thu Duc, close to Saigon. It is partially in use now and is expected to be fully operational by April, 1967. This facility possesses double the ca-

capacity of existing port transit warehouses for civil cargo.

g. Other Saigon area warehouse facilities have been expanded to expedite port clearance.

h. AID has procured or contracted for 552 trucks, 156 barges, 13 tugs and 213 pieces of handling equipment (e.g., cranes and fork lifts) to facilitate port operations. More is being procured—all additional to the port equipment furnished by the United States military.

i. Ten coastal vessels and a 3,000 ton per month junk fleet have been chartered to help move cargo from Saigon to other ports.

j. The load on the port of Saigon has been reduced by the expansion of facilities at a number of other Vietnamese ports including Quang Ngai, Qui Nhon, Nha Trang, Danang and Cam Ranh Bay. The capacity of these ports has been increased more than three-fold, from 125,000 metric tons per month in August, 1965, to more than 400,000 metric tons at present.

Increased physical facilities must be supplemented by improved management in processing materiel through the port area. In this field, we have supplied many United States advisory services. Typical examples are:

(1) Since March 1966, a United States Customs Bureau team detailed to AID has been increased from one to ten and will be expanded to twenty. . . . This team is working closely with the Vietnamese Customs Bureau in its actual operations and improving its procedures and systems.

(2) A four-man United States Census Bureau team, serving with AID since August 1966, is assisting the Vietnamese Customs Bureau and the Ministry of Finance in developing automated data processing systems to provide rapid and accurate financial and logistical information.

(3) United States civilian and military port advisers are assisting the port authorities of Vietnam in improving reporting and inventory control systems and port operations.

(4) An eight-member team from the International Longshoremen's Union worked with the Saigon stevedoring companies during most of 1966 to advise on techniques for increasing cargo handling capability.

(5) In September 1966, the United States Army's 125th Terminal Command arrived in Vietnam to supplement the services of the AID technical advisers to the director of the port of Saigon and his staff. All of its 187 officers and enlisted men are assigned to the commercial area and working in scheduling of ships, unloading and warehousing procedures, importer notification, etc. The unit has also set up a documentation system for commercial cargo parallel to the combined coverage of the four separate and distinct Vietnamese systems maintained by the Saigon port director, the ship's agent, the stevedore and the Customs Bureau.

Also, as Mrs. Bentley's articles have noted, there has been a need to tighten security precautions in order to protect the incoming cargoes. A few of the measures already undertaken are:

a. The Vietnamese Customs Bureau has 1,700 employees, 1,300 working in the Saigon port. Their enforcement operations include the use of several large launches and 12 smaller boats provided by AID in September, 1966.

b. The Vietnamese harbor police has increased to 600 men engaged in physical security of the port area. It has checkpoints at a number of strategic port locations and regular water patrols covering 96 kilometers of waterways containing up to 1,400 barges, junks, lighters, and other miscellaneous small boats, many of which double as homes for one or more families.

c. The harbor police director also controls the activities of a 167-man police field force

unit recently assigned to the An Khanh area directly across the Saigon River from the main piers.

d. Society de Surveillance (Geneve) S.A., a private Swiss international shipping inspector, experienced in Vietnam, is under contract to the AID mission to inspect deliveries of several types of AID-financed and Food for Peace commodities, as well as to check rice shipments arriving in the ports of Qui Nhon and Nha Trang.

e. American MP's board each vessel arriving at Cap St. Jacques and remain aboard during waiting, river transit and unloading. These heightened security efforts are reflected in the fact that port area arrests for improper documentation, trespassing, theft and other offenses rose from a rate of 150 per month in early 1966 to 500 a month by the end of 1966, while reports of major crimes dropped. . . .

I will not undertake to respond in detail to the several unwarranted allegations in Mrs. Bentley's articles, but two major ones do warrant specific comment.

The allegation is made that AID is forcing into the country commercial imports which are not wanted by the Vietnamese merchants. This ignores some basic facts:

With few exceptions, of which fertilizer is one, all imports respond to requirements registered by importers who guarantee payment with their own funds.

One of the major objectives of these commercial imports, that of controlling inflation, has been largely realized.

We are not sure of the exact nature of the Saigon Chamber of Commerce remarks or the motives in contributing to the allegations, but it may well stem from resentment on the part of some in the commercial community at our strong measures to reform the commercial import program in order to broaden competition, eliminate a number of abuses that had developed earlier, and substantially reduce the opportunities for speculation and unduly large profit margins.

Regarding the allegation that large unneeded quantities of fertilizer were offered, the difficulty in 1966 arose from the Vietnamese Government's devaluation in June (an essential step recommended by the International Monetary Fund) which suddenly doubled the landed cost to importers. However, the Vietnamese Government did not properly adjust the ceiling price at which importers could resell it. Vietnamese delays in resolving this problem, over which AID had no direct control, caused most of the commercial dealers to refuse to accept some fertilizer shipments. The temporary pile-up of fertilizer ships was resolved by AID's making other arrangements for its distribution. The fertilizer was transferred to the account of the National Agricultural Credit Office, which has country-wide branches and which is now charged with ordering, storage, and sale to commercial distributors or direct sale to farmers.

In closing I cite the judgment of Mr. Austin J. Tobin, executive director, the Port of New York Authority, who has just recently visited Saigon. He states: "The port of Saigon is handling more than we have a right to expect considering all of the difficulties and circumstances, and the overriding necessity of meeting requirements for large amounts of military and civil cargo."

WILLIAM S. GAUD,
Administrator, Agency for International Development.
WASHINGTON.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, there is one very important matter on which I was pleased to hear the President dwell

in depth in his message on the District of Columbia. That is his plan for a complete reorganization of the present cumbersome form of District government, and its replacement with a structure more efficient and responsive to the urban problems which Washington faces in a century of rapid growth and intensive development.

I am strongly in favor of home rule for the District of Columbia—I think it is one of the keys to the District's future. But I share the President's feeling that we must act now to effect some improvement in the structure of District government—with or without home rule. There is absolutely no reason why the Congress must continue to accept an old form of government that was developed to meet old problems which have now passed into history.

In 1874, when "Boss" Shepherd had forced the District deeply into debt by promoting his overly ambitious plans for public improvement, it might have been historically necessary to set up a Commission government so that one person could not dictate the sole course of District affairs. It might also have been necessary, then, to assign an officer of the Army Corps of Engineers to complete the multitudinous public works commenced by Shepherd.

But now, almost 100 years later, local government has certainly graduated beyond the era of civic bossism. Yet, we are still confronted by a commission form of municipal government; a form of government which has proved so ineffective throughout the country that it has been abandoned by most cities which once adopted it.

Whatever the high qualifications of the officers assigned to serve on the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, and the good works they have accomplished, the time has come to create a new form of government with a new division of responsibilities and—if you will—a new vision of what local government in the Nation's Capital could be and ought to be.

It appears to me that the action contemplated by President Johnson is absolutely right, necessary, and long overdue. As I understand his message, the Board of Commissioners of the District will be replaced by a single Commissioner who becomes chief administrator of District government. A nine-member council, roughly comparable to a city council, will translate congressional mandates into rules and regulations and be implemented by the Commissioner. The council also approves the Commissioner's budget for submission to the President and Congress.

Even at first glance, this seems to me to be a much more businesslike arrangement for managing municipal affairs than our present system.

We in Congress often complain a good deal about the way the District is managed. Yet, our complaints are less than valid until we ourselves provide more logical and more modern tools by which the District can manage its own affairs. District government reorganization is one of those tools.

I look forward to the submission of the

President's reorganization plan for the District, and I shall give it my firm support.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED CRIME BILL

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, at this time, I would like to say that I have read with great interest the President's proposed crime bill for the District of Columbia. The scope of these proposals is broadly based, as I believe any effective legislation in the criminal area must be, and it is my belief that these proposals will go a long way toward stopping and finally turning the tide of criminal activity here in the District.

The proposal dealing with street citations is particularly interesting and important. I feel it will put more authority in the hands of the police at the crucial moment where a police officer must determine whether or not to arrest an individual or let him go. I believe that this type of proposal gives the police officer another alternative rather than simply allowing him to decide whether or not the individual should be arrested and jailed, or turned free. It also works benefits for persons accused of crimes in that the citation gives that individual greater flexibility in preparing for defense as opposed to an arrest which would require that he be taken to the police station.

It is this kind of creative legislation that is necessary if we are to effectively combat crime while at the same time protecting individual liberties.

I strongly favor the provisions of the President's proposal that I have mentioned and also support this type of legislation in general. The need for action in combating crime in the District of Columbia is immediate, and I hope my fellow Congressmen agree with me in this regard and move with speed toward enactment of this legislation.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Friday, February 24, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] made a most interesting speech on the floor of the Senate with reference to U.S. foreign policy in general and our posture in Vietnam in particular.

Because much of that speech deals with the same subject matter as the pending supplemental authorization bill, I want to comment about it at this point.

The speech is entitled "It's One World." There is no doubt, of course, that Wendell Willkie was right when he coined that phrase a good many years ago and wrote a book about it.

It is one world. It is a smaller world every day. It is a more complex world every day.

But, because it is one world, it does not necessarily follow that our present foreign policy posture, both in Vietnam and elsewhere, is correct.

The concept of a small and shrinking world and the heavy responsibilities the United States has in connection with that world have recently been brought to the attention of the country through Senate Foreign Relations Committee

hearings, at which skilled historians, diplomats, and soldiers referred to America's responsibilities as a world power.

Later this afternoon, I will discuss the testimony of these very able gentlemen, including former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, George Kennan; former Ambassador to Japan, Professor Reischauer, now back again teaching at Harvard; the dean of American historians, now teaching at Amherst, Henry Steele Commager; and Gen. James Gavin, a former distinguished soldier and Chief of Plans in the Pentagon, an Army man, former Ambassador to France, and presently chairman of the board of the widely known Arthur D. Little & Co., of Boston, manager-consultants for many of the great corporations of America.

It is significant that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] started his speech with the suggestion that perhaps the main Vietnam battlefield was not above and below the 17th parallel in Southeast Asia, but was right here in the United States of America, where the battle for public opinion is being fought. I agree with this, as I agree with many of the statements of the distinguished Senator from Washington in the speech to which I have reference.

He then stated that we cannot be defeated militarily in South Vietnam, and with this I would agree, too; but the main question is no longer, can we be defeated on the battlefield? That question was answered in the negative when President Johnson, without a declaration of war, undertook to send, first 100,000, then 200,000, then 300,000, and now 400,000 American boys to fight in South Vietnam and to bomb North Vietnam in order to prevent a military defeat.

That military action by our Commander in Chief—I say again without a declaration of war—did stem the tide.

Before that action was taken, our South Vietnamese allies were well on their way to losing the war; and the best military advice the President could get was that, if we did not have this massive intervention by American troops, military victory would go to the Vietcong and their allies of the Hanoi government.

But the tide has been turned, and I agree with Senator JACKSON that we are very unlikely to lose the military war in South Vietnam. That, however, to my mind, does not answer the two major questions.

First, can we win a military victory at a cost acceptable to the American people, and at a cost which does not include the destruction of most of South Vietnam and most of the logistical facilities and urban facilities of North Vietnam, leaving behind us utter devastation and hate for the white man on both sides of the 17th parallel?

The second question is whether this kind of war—a guerrilla war, a civil war—which yellow men are fighting for their independence against a white country—can ever be won in the hearts and minds of men, not only in Vietnam but across the one world of which we have been talking?

I must recall again, as I have many times before, the statement made by President John F. Kennedy within 2

months of the date of his assassination, when he said—and I paraphrase and do not quote—this is their war, referring to the South Vietnamese; we can help them with technical assistance, money, advice, but they have got to win it; and, in effect, we do not intend to try to win it for them.

That was over 3 years ago. Senators will recall in the 1964 presidential campaign, President Johnson said time after time, rebutting Senator Goldwater's belligerent position, that he did not want to see American boys doing the fighting Asian boys should do.

His clear and pertinent point was that the liberty and freedom of all Vietnam was the problem and the task and the obligation of the Vietnamese, and not of the Americans.

That is not so today. I think it reasonably clear that most of the fighting is being done by American forces. Many weeks, and some months, the major amount of dying is being done by American boys fighting, ostensibly, for the freedom of the South Vietnamese.

I do not charge that the South Vietnamese Army has become militarily ineffective. Occasionally we see evidence of fine military action on their part. But undoubtedly the burden of the war has been transferred from South Vietnamese shoulders to American shoulders.

The frequently stated American obligation is search and destroy the enemy, whereas enemy pacification—clearing and holding—has been turned over to the South Vietnamese. I suggest much more holding than clearing is being done by the South Vietnamese; thus, most of the fighting, and the major burden of the dying, is being transferred from the South Vietnamese to the Americans.

For many years, the South Vietnamese made no serious effort to clear out the Mekong Delta, the rice bowl of South Vietnam often leaving it largely under Vietcong control.

Therefore, the rice-exporting country of South Vietnam has now become a rice-importing country. Who pays for the rice? Of course. The Americans.

Thus, it has been decided to move the American Army into the Mekong Delta to search and destroy the enemy and allow the South Vietnamese to clear up the wreckage and pacify the villagers. This, of course, betokens heavier American than South Vietnamese casualties.

So I find it not particularly edifying when my good friend from Washington suggests we cannot be defeated militarily, and that we must not turn from one extreme to another. The first extreme the Senator mentioned is total withdrawal from Vietnam, and the second extreme is total, all-out warfare against North Vietnam, and perhaps China and Russia, to win an overwhelming military victory.

I agree with the Senator from Washington in that comment. I know of nobody in the Senate who has seriously proposed the United States unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam.

Let me make my position quite clear. I believe I speak for other Members of the Senate as well in saying we should stop this search-and-destroy operation which is costing so much life. We should turn back to the South Vietnamese the

burden of offensive action against their fellow countrymen, the Vietcong, and against the troops from the North who are, in a very real degree, their fellow countrymen also. Remember the present dictator of South Vietnam, Air Marshal Ky, is himself from the north, as are many of his Cabinet members.

I would leave the Mekong Delta to the South Vietnamese Army. I would accept the views of Ambassador Kennan, General Ridgway, and General Gavin, and make it very clear indeed that nobody is going to throw us out of South Vietnam, that we neither propose nor choose to get out until we establish freedom of the Vietnamese to choose the kind of government under which they want to live, whether there be one Vietnam or two. I do not like to use the word "enclave" because that has become subject to some scorn. I would prefer to propose we fight a defensive war.

Many successful defensive wars have been fought through history. Perhaps the most famous one was fought by Fabius, the ancient Roman, when he finally destroyed Hannibal, who had crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and the Alps with his elephants, and spent 2 unprofitable years in Italy, trying to defeat the Roman Army.

The situations are, of course, essentially different. I do not believe even the leaders in Hanoi think they can beat the American Army in pitched battle. Nevertheless, Fabian's tactic finally saved Italy for Rome. I would suggest that, at an infinitely smaller cost in deaths, in wounded, in materiel and equipment, and in money, we could assure that Hanoi—and Peking and Moscow, if you will, shall not work their will in South Vietnam and kick the Americans out.

They cannot throw us out, and I do not advocate that we should get out, and neither does any other Senator. So much for that strawman.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Washington when he opposes escalating this war to a far greater extent than it has been escalated already, with the imminent danger of bringing both China and Russia into the contest, possibly loosing atomic bombs. A few misguided individuals—I suspect some in the Pentagon, maybe even one or two in the State Department and in the entourage of the President in the White House, but certainly not the President himself and certainly not the Secretary of State, nor the Secretary of Defense—advocate that kind of all-out war. But so far, that theory seems to be largely confined to defeated candidates for the Presidency of the United States; and I hope that it will stay just there, and operate no further.

So this idea of all-out war is a kind of strawman also—not a realistic alternative for men of common sense, charged with the heavy responsibility of finding out how we can get out of Vietnam with honor. We shall never be able to get out of Vietnam with honor by destroying the country and inducing the inception of World War III.

So I say again that I agree with Senator Jackson in deploring both those extremes. But I suggest what we should do, and are not doing, is to shift our

emphasis from military action to a more aggressive diplomacy and try to get to the conference table, where in the end this war will be settled, just as most wars in our history have been settled.

My concern is that so many of my fellow Senators apparently lack a keen desire to bring the war to negotiations but rather seem content to continue the war, with its ever-mounting list of American casualties.

Our clear-and-hold policy and our pacification policy have been complete failures.

I wish to read into the RECORD in that connection a colloquy appearing on page 48 of the hearings on the pending bill. The colloquy was between Senator Young of North Dakota, a member of the Armed Services Committee, and Secretary of Defense McNamara. It reads:

Senator Young of North Dakota. Last year, Mr. Secretary, you stated with respect to the population of South Vietnam and Ky government controlled 53 percent, the Vietcong, 23, and 23 percent in disputed areas. With respect to the land areas you said your own estimate was that the Vietcong controls 60 percent of the land area. Has this situation changed in the last year?

Secretary McNamara. I do not think so, Senator Young. I noticed some figures yesterday or the day before that showed that the Vietnamese Government controlled, I think they said, 54 to 56 percent of the population.

Apparently the figures are up 1 percent or, at the most, 3 percent over 12 months earlier.

I continue to read from the statement made by Secretary McNamara:

I do not put too much weight on those figures, because of the way in which they are compiled. But I think the figures I gave you last year are fairly representative of the situation today.

So we have not gained anything in terms of population of the land controlled as the result of the most aggressive military operations conducted certainly since the height of the Korean campaign.

We then come to an interesting colloquy, one which I find disturbing to Senator Young. It reads:

Senator Young of North Dakota. Will we greatly expand our operations in the delta area this year? I understood a few months ago that this was not scheduled for calendar year 1967, but we are moving in there now.

That is my information, too. It has been published in the newspapers all over the country. We are not only moving into the delta, but we have moved into the delta, and the various units which have come into there have been active. Accounts have been given of one or two of the battles of the search-and-destroy operations which they have conducted.

All that Senator Young asked was:

Will we be expanding our operations in the delta this year?

Listen to what was done with the answer to that question. The transcript reads:

Secretary McNamara. [Deleted.]

General Wheeler. [Deleted.]

General Westmoreland—

Said General Wheeler—

is going to put a brigade of the Ninth Infantry Division at a location in the vicinity of My Tho, which is south of Saigon in the Delta [deleted].

The rest of his statement was deleted.

Senator YOUNG either asked another question or made a comment and that was deleted.

Secretary McNamara then said something and that was deleted.

With that kind of censorship, it is a little hard for the average Senator who does not serve on the Armed Services Committee to have much idea of what our intentions are in the delta. So all I can do is accept what the newspaper reports said, and it was on the basis of the newspaper reports that I made my comments a short time ago on our activities in the delta.

I should like to read also into the RECORD a colloquy which appears at page 101 of the hearings between the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], whom I see in the Chamber, and Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Senator MANSFIELD said:

Mr. McNamara, on page 6 of your testimony yesterday, you indicated the basic tasks which flow from this war:

"2. To interdict the flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam.

"3. To exert pressure on the Government of North Vietnam to cease its direction and support of insurrection in South Vietnam."

Am I to understand that this is a war directed not only against aggression from the North, but also is a civil war directed against insurrectionaries within South Vietnam?

Secretary McNamara then replied:

I think the answer is No, Senator Mansfield. That is not what this statement was meant to say, nor is it my view of the war. Without arguing the point of the origin of the conflict, our analysis indicated to us that it would not have started, it certainly wouldn't have reached the present scale without active direction of the action in the south by the north.

Captured documents, [deleted] and other sources of intelligence appear to support that conclusion. Now having said that, I want to emphasize also that the direction from the north could not possibly have succeeded in activating the support it has had in the south, unless there had been what I will call indigenous support desiring to modify by revolutionary action, the economic and political institutions of the south.

I congratulate the Secretary of Defense on his mastery of the English language. Listen to that again: "Indigenous support desiring to modify by revolutionary action, the economic and political institutions of the south."

If that is not civil war in two words, I do not know what civil war is.

Senator MANSFIELD then said:

Mr. Secretary, I understand your point of view. I don't agree with it, because, according to the Webster Dictionary, an insurrection is "a rising up against civil or political authority."

I agree with the Senator from Montana.

I continue to read from the statement made by the Senator from Montana:

It is my belief that in its beginning this was a civil war that has been added to by the infiltration of Hanoi.

I agree with that statement and I yield to the Senator from Montana be-

cause of his understanding and personal experience as a result of several trips he has made to South Vietnam.

Senators will recall the very able, if pessimistic report he made to the President and to the Senate a year or so ago when he predicted exactly what has happened: the continuing escalation with a resultant threat of the onset of world war III through the intervention of China and/or Russia in the event our military activities came to threaten the capabilities as a combat force of the army of North Vietnam.

Continuing with what Senator MANSFIELD said:

It is my belief that in its beginning this was a civil war that has been added to by the infiltration of Hanoi. That cadres in very, very small extent did not start coming down until the latter part of 1964—

That is, from the north—

according to information which was received from the Department of Defense and checked and rechecked and not denied. So, to me, it is a combination of a civil war in the south and an attack by Hanoi from the north, perhaps to direct the war effort, certainly to assist and to cooperate with the Vietcong. It appears to me that on the basis of newspaper reports recently, that we are considering stepped-up activities in the Mekong Delta. In that respect, I assume that you are aware, certainly far more than I am—I am no military expert—that when you go into the Mekong Delta, you are going into the most difficult part of all Vietnam, far tougher than the central highlands and far tougher than the area along the demilitarized zone, and if I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments about the Mekong which can be refuted or confirmed.

It is my understanding that down there in the delta, there are 25,000 miles of waterways and canals. The people number 7 million, clustered along the estuaries of the Mekong. That the enemy is harder to identify in the delta than anywhere else in Vietnam.

I interpolate that the enemy is pretty hard to identify everywhere in Vietnam, as many an American, who thought he was dealing with a friend, who turned out to be a foe, has found. This, of course, is one of the great disadvantages confronting a white army attempting to suppress guerrilla warfare in a country where everybody looks alike; where many of those little men—many of them brave, indeed—have chosen sides, just as was done in the American Civil War, or the War Between the States, as some of my friends prefer to call it. But the men fighting guerrilla warfare in Vietnam wear no uniform at all. So it is indeed difficult, as Senator MANSFIELD said, to identify friends and foes in Vietnam, particularly so in the delta. I continue to quote from Senator MANSFIELD's statement:

That the Vietcong has an extensive delta organization and continues to feed large quantities of men, supplies, and money to Vietcong units further north.

That, to repeat, the delta is a far worse area to fight in than the rest of Vietnam, and I think perhaps that might be given some degree of proof by the recent amphibious operation, which accomplished very little in a 10-day period, if my memory is correct.

Furthermore, that to many people in the delta the Vietcong is a nationalist and a village hero and not a Communist.

I interpolate again that most of them would not care whether he was a Communist or not, because what those people are interested in are at least one square meal a day, a roof that does not leak over their head, and an opportunity to carry on a normal, peaceful life of birth, death, and the raising of families. That is what this cruel and dirty war is denying them. They denied it to themselves at first through civil war, and now the Americans have undertaken to come in from many thousands of miles across the sea to deny it to them in their own country, in the interest of preserving there freedom and training them in the ways of democracy.

I return to Senator MANSFIELD's statement: "that years of war have taught the Vietcong every aspect of guerrilla warfare in the Mekong area. That no North Vietnamese regulars have been found in the delta south of the Saigon area. That the delta Vietcong are masters at camouflage, know all the ins and outs of the waterways in the countryside, and at present number approximately—"

In comes our old friend "deleted." Senator MANSFIELD, I feel reasonably certain—he will deny it, if I am wrong—picked that figure out of a newspaper report somewhere, but now it is deleted in the text of the hearings.

Well-trained battalions.

In addition, there is a large guerrilla force bringing the enemy's delta force to [deleted] armed men.

One more statement. It is my impression, too, that many Vietcong battalions recruited in the delta are now fighting in the northern areas and they could be moved back. Is that a correct summary in brief of the situation there?

Secretary McNAMARA. Senator Mansfield, you made a number of statements, not all of which I was able to note as I listened to you, and I will comment on some of them, and those I do not comment on, I do not necessarily support. It's simply that my memory—

Senator MANSFIELD. Shall I ask them one by one?

Secretary McNAMARA. You may not want to take time. Let me comment on them. I simply want to point out that my failure to rebut or comment on a particular statement doesn't mean I endorse it.

Then Secretary McNAMARA went on to state that Senator MANSFIELD's description of the delta was quite correct. He agreed that the Vietcong are very strong in the delta, as Senator MANSFIELD said. He agreed that:

They are not only strong there, but they use that area as a base of supply of food and weapons for their forces in the central and northern parts of South Vietnam, and, of course, that is why it is important to begin to weaken their hold on the delta.

What Secretary McNAMARA said in response to Senator MANSFIELD's third point is deleted. He said, however:

I think it is quite clear that the backbone of their strength is represented by men infiltrated from the North to serve as cadres and leaders, and on his point I would take exception with what I understood you to say somewhat earlier—that it was not until 1964 that cadres, small in number, came down from the North.

Let me point out again, however, that

many thousands of members of the South Vietnamese Army are also infiltrators from the north. General Ky said only a few days ago—and I am sure he would not have made this kind of statement if he were not convinced it was correct—that there are only about 10,000 Communists who form the leadership of the Vietcong. We have been told that the Vietcong army forces—regulars, irregulars, and the North Vietnamese troops associated with them—total 275,000 men. That includes some 45,000 North Vietnamese regulars. So if those figures are correct—and I believe they are official figures; if not, they came from a reputable newspaperman who has been there—that means that of approximately 230,000 Vietcong, only 10,000 are Communists. That does not surprise me very much, because I would hazard the guess that not many guerrillas fighting with the Vietcong could tell you what the difference is between a Communist and a capitalist. They do not know, and they do not care. They just want to be let alone. They want the Americans to go home and let them alone to work out their own problems in their country.

Another interesting comment appears on page 103 of the hearings. It bears out a colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on the same point last year. At that time I did not have available to me the hearings and the colloquy between Senator MANSFIELD and Secretary McNamara.

Senator MANSFIELD said, as quoted on page 103:

Senator MANSFIELD. One brief question. Does it cost about \$400,000 to kill a Vietcong or a North Vietnamese?

Secretary McNAMARA. I wouldn't like to try to give you a figure. It costs a great deal indeed. The reason I can't give you a figure is that it is almost impossible to develop a meaningful estimate of the incremental cost of our operations in Vietnam, but it costs a lot, let's put it that way.

I wonder what Mr. McNamara meant by "incremental cost." That is stylish English.

Senator MANSFIELD. Hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, certainly a large amount. I have seen figures of \$100,000, \$200,000. I haven't seen any figure reported as large as \$400,000, but it certainly costs a very large amount. I would certainly agree with that.

Mr. President, last Thursday I suggested to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who was unwilling to place a precise figure on how much it cost to kill a Vietcong or a Hanoi regular, that he might take the amount being spent each month on the war in Vietnam, which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] agreed was approximately \$2 billion a month, and divide that figure by our claims of how many Vietcong we were currently killing. To make the figure a little more accurate, it might be placed on the 12-month basis.

The Department of Defense has furnished us with figures with respect to Vietcong and North Vietnamese killed in action. For the year 1966 the figure is 55,000. So, if we compute the necessary mathematics on the basis of \$2 billion a month, the figure comes out to

\$436,000 for every Vietcong killed. I suggest that Senator MANSFIELD was, if anything, underestimating the cost of this war in terms of what the Department of Defense, much to my chagrin, seems to think is the daily figure that the United States is interested in: How many Vietcong did you kill yesterday; how many will you kill tomorrow; how many are you going to kill today?

To me a constantly recurring statistic does as much as any one thing to brutalize this war and brutalize the American people unless they are as shocked by it as I have been, which I hope.

I was going to read more from Senator MANSFIELD's colloquy with Secretary McNamara, but I note that it is so full of deletions that it seems hardly worthwhile taking the time to do so.

About this time last year, when we were considering a supplemental defense authorization, Secretary McNamara was before the Committee on Armed Services and had this colloquy with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young].

The Senator said as quoted on page 341:

Well, in the course of the conversation I had with General Stilwell, he stated that 80 percent of the VC fighting in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in the Mekong Delta. Have you any comment on that?

Secretary McNAMARA. Again, I cannot reply specifically where they were born and raised, but I think it is fair to say that a high percentage, if not 80 percent, were recruited from the South.

Again, we should keep in mind the basic fact that most of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese. Hardly 45,000 out of 275,000 fighting men opposed to ours come from Hanoi. Most of the rest are civil war participants fighting for what they think—and I disagree with them strongly—is a cause which is in the best interests of their country.

I return to the speech of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. He makes the point that we cannot justify the cost of our Vietnamese stand in terms of Vietnam alone; and again, that we must see beyond Vietnam, for what is going on there has its impact in Europe and all over Asia. With this I also agree. I agree that the stakes in Vietnam are related to our foreign and defense policies as a whole because they are destroying a chance for a just and lasting peace elsewhere in the world.

And yet, in another way, they are not so vital for us, for if we were not there, the chance of peace would right now, in my judgment, be substantially improved. In other words, I suggest that many of us have misread the stakes in this war.

I feel the most important stake is how to come to an accommodation with Russia over serious problems that divide us in Southeast Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere. Every day the bombing of North Vietnam continues places us 1 day further from those essential negotiations which I still hope can lead to a just and lasting peace, coupled with arms control and disarmament measures, which lie ready for the negotiating table once the shooting stops and the bombing stops in Vietnam.

Senator JACKSON says we must oppose the revision of the status quo, and I as-

sume he means everywhere, by aggression. I suggest there are places where our vital interests are affected and a change in governmental status quo does require us to intervene to prevent it. We thought that was the case in the Dominican Republic when we intervened, successfully only in the end, as a universal policeman moving into the domestic concern of any country where he believed freedom and democracy were threatened.

I deplored our activity before in the Dominican Republic and I shall one day return to a calm and historical analysis of that venture.

I must admit it appears to have been successful. A freely elected government runs the Dominican Republic, supported and sustained almost entirely by American dollars.

But we did not do that in Cuba. We got our fingers burned in the Bay of Pigs. We did not move in with our Armed Forces at the time of the missile crisis.

I wonder why we found it wise—and I personally think it was wise—not to intervene in a military way in the Cuban situation.

Nonetheless, we thought it so important, several years later, to deploy over 400,000 men, and goodness knows how many airplanes and naval vessels, in an effort to—as we say—prevent aggression, and—as they say—to remove a dictatorial and Fascist dictatorship in the interest of what they consider the peace and freedom of their own country.

Thus, I must differ with my good friend from Washington on the implications in his statement. It is not explicit, it is implicit that we are, in effect, the world's policeman.

I suggest that we would be well advised to take a good, hard look at a map of the world and determine where our vital national interests would be affected by a change in the status quo and the coming into power of a government which we did not like.

I wonder, if we would do that, how we could justify not going into Cuba, which is only 90 miles from our shores and, yet, going in which such a massive force in South Vietnam?

I suggest that U.S. diplomacy since the days of the Eisenhower administration has been heavyhanded. Perhaps great power has come to us too quickly. But, we have blundered, and blundered badly, in practically every instance where we have used naked, military power to support or to change a particular governmental status quo.

I suggest that this is true because of two things:

First, we are not sophisticated enough to understand the limitations of power and its wise use. Perhaps, even more, because we have forgotten the famous dictum of Lord Acton, when he said:

Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Perhaps Senators have read the article written by James Reston in last Sunday's New York Times, on its editorial page, on corruption and ethics. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: HOW CORRUPT IS AMERICA?
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 25.—How Corrupt is America? This is not a popular question. Moral speculation is "out" in New York and Washington, but even the sophisticates of the great commercial, artistic and political capitals of the United States cannot avoid the question.

They have been through too much in the last few years to avoid even if they scoff at the question of corruption. The assassination of a President, the violence of the racial struggle, the civil disorders in the cities, the war in Vietnam, the conflict in the universities, the Oswald case, the Powell case, the Ruby case, the Senator Dodd case, the Bobby Baker case, the C.I.A. case, the wiretapping cases, the argument over who is telling the truth in the White House; in the Manchester-Kennedy book controversy; in the J. Edgar Hoover-Kennedy argument about wiretapping—all this has produced too many boat-rocking facts to be dismissed as the silly moralizing of cranky world-bettering reformers.

THE BIG QUESTION

In fact, this question about the corruption of personal and institutional standards in America is the one thing that troubles most of the leaders on all sides of all the current controversies. Rich and poor, black and white, Republican and Democrat, hawks and doves, are all worrying about it. Of course they are all complaining about the corruption of somebody else, but at least they are united on one proposition—that something is wrong, that there is now no common code of conduct in the United States that unites the nation and guides its people about what is right and what is wrong.

Washington consistently tries to avoid facing this fact. The leaders of both parties in the Congress know that the Central Intelligence Agency's activities need to be investigated, but they have decided this week not to investigate it. The President knows that he is responsible for what the C.I.A. has been doing to use university students for intelligence purposes, but he is passing the buck to Nick Katzenbach at the State Department, John Gardner at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Richard Helms at the C.I.A.

Nevertheless, these political maneuvers will not work in the end. The Congressional leaders may try to smother the C.I.A. controversy, but some members of the Congress will insist on talking about it in the House and Senate. The President may try to correct the system quietly—and the evidence is that he is trying to correct it fairly—but members of his Administration will insist on talking honestly and openly about the facts, and this is the main point of the question of corruption.

The habit of honesty in the United States, in its people and institutions, is still too strong to be overwhelmed. Whatever else can be said about the press, it will print the facts about the C.I.A. ties to the American Newspaper Guild or to prominent newspaper publishers. Whatever the Congressional leaders decide to do about not investigating the C.I.A., members of Congress will discuss the problem.

TRADITION AND CONSCIENCE

Some student leaders may take money from the C.I.A. and be quiet about it, but others, troubled by tradition or conscience, will express what they really think. Some politicians will defend the Administration regardless of what it does, but others will tell the truth, even if it hurts their own party. Some newspapers will not risk the dangers of defying political power, commercial power and labor union power, but a few

will, and when they do, their disclosures will be widely reported by the news agencies and the radio and television networks to the rest of the nation.

In this sense the institutions of America are not corrupted. They are under pressure of various kinds but something in the tradition of the country keeps them doing what they were intended to do under the Constitution.

A good case, therefore, can be made for the proposition that while there is plenty of corruption in America, the corruption is somehow exposed, and condemned by the nation when it is exposed. Bobby Baker, Adam Clayton Powell, Senator Dodd, all had their day but they were caught. The legal system trapped Baker, and the Congress has brought both Powell and Dodd to the bar of the Congress. The C.I.A. tried to conceal its arrangements with students, radio stations, magazines, and student organizations, but the facts came out.

Fortunately, the Johnson Administration now understands this fundamental point. It has stopped its secret funds to the students. It is finally reviewing all its activities with universities, labor unions, and other private organizations. It is looking for ways to finance legitimate student programs by open and private means, and the Congress is now more sympathetic to this procedure.

INFLUENCE OF THE PUBLIC

The mail coming into the White House and the Congress is a major factor in all this—much more than the letterwriters realize. These letters are expressing the moral conscience of the nation. They are arguing for equality of the races. They are calling for moderation in the war, and protesting violently against the past activities of Powell, Baker, Dodd, and others who have been accused of misusing political power.

Public opinion in America in this way still exercises great influence. It affects the decisions of the Executive and the legislature. It is for equality, peace, and freedom. It is more powerful than the lobbyists for special interests. And it is a much greater force for moderation in the White House and in the Congress than is generally realized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I fear that the whole problem of misuse of military power has not been given adequate consideration either in the White House, the Pentagon, or "Foggy Bottom."

As the Senator from Washington stated, of course we champion peaceful change. That is easy. The big question is, advocates of peaceful change and resisters of aggression though we may be, have we read the facts right when we justify sending 400,000 young Americans into the jungles in southeast Asia to intervene in what is essentially a dirty little civil war?

I suspect that we blundered because we overreached ourselves, not understanding the wise use of that enormous power which we possess today.

The Senator from Washington suggests that we should be governed by the old-fashioned balance-of-power theory.

That balance of power did succeed for almost 100 years, from the Treaty of Vienna in 1815 up until the outbreak of World War I in 1914 in, generally speaking, keeping the peace. But those were the days before nuclear war. Those were the days before radiological, biological, and chemical warfare. Those were the days when Europe was the main consideration. Latin America, Africa, and practically all of Asia were not particularly affected by the balance of

power because there was no great Asian power, as China has since become, and as Japan was once—and will be again—which could act as a countervailing balance of power against the white colonials in that part of the world.

The Senator from Washington refers to SEATO as a treaty commitment on our part requiring us—perhaps he did not say, "requiring," but I suggest it is implied—requiring us to move into Vietnam. This comment has been made on several occasions by Secretary of State Rusk, but only after he had made practically every other argument that could be thought of to justify our intervention in the civil war, which he denies is a civil war. As I understand it, he still contends that this is nothing more than aggression from the North with the Vietcong the tools of the Hanoi government.

This is a contention which, incidentally, I think is becoming weaker and weaker and less credible as time goes on—particularly in light of the statistics which I quoted a little earlier.

With respect to the SEATO Treaty, let me quote a statement made by Lt. Gen. Jesus Vargas, Secretary General of SEATO, at the opening of the 11th Council meeting in Canberra, Australia, on June 27, 1966:

"Viet-Nam, therefore, rather than being held up as a symbol of SEATO's alleged inaction, should be looked upon for what it actually is—a symbol of spontaneity, the determination and the singleness of purpose with which many free countries from different parts of the world have come to the aid of an embattled friend and ally. In relation to SEATO in particular, Viet-Nam is incontrovertible proof of the wide latitude of freedom open to individual members of the alliance to choose the manner and degree of assistance to be rendered, or even for any one member to withhold assistance or keep the matter under consideration for as long as it pleases.

"As we all know, assistance under the Manila Pact may be either collective or individual. This permits member nations to undertake, along with nonmember countries holding common values and persuasions, and on their own individual choice, actions necessary to preserve peace and freedom in our part of the world."

How could it be more abundantly clear that the Secretary of State is wrong when he relies on an obligation in the SEATO treaty to justify our massive interjection of forces in Vietnam in support of one of the parties in a civil war?

We hear much about the atrocities and terrorism of the Vietcong; and I do not doubt that what we hear is true. I deplore it. I hold no brief for those terrorists. But it is equally true that similar acts of terrorism have been committed by our allies, the South Vietnamese, from the beginning.

If one has to choose between a Fascist dictator who so admires Hitler and a Communist dictator—if we can ever find out who he is—perhaps Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi; we do not seem to know exactly who the civilian or even the military leaders of the National Liberation Front are—I suppose we would have to conclude that there is not so much to choose from, as so many seem to think there is, between fascism and communism.

Having said that, I wanted to make it clear that I am significantly encouraged by the efforts being made by the South Vietnamese, without much encouragement from the present dictator, Ky, to create a constituent assembly which would, in turn, draft a democratic and free constitution.

I applaud that effort. I hope it will be successful. I hope it will result in a freely elected government in South Vietnam. But this will require the military to keep their hands off that constitution. They have retained the right to reject any part of it they do not like. I suspect there should be an obligation on the part of the military also to see that there is a free election, and that the candidates for the legislative branch of the South Vietnamese Government and, indeed, the new President, will be chosen without fear, favor, ballot-stuffing, or the other notorious tricks of the trade to prevent a free election.

So I suggest that the balance of power is a dangerous doctrine in the nuclear age. This is a subject on which my very good friend from Washington [Mr. Jackson] and I have disagreed for a number of years. I should like to state very briefly the nature of that disagreement. The Senator from Washington not only doubts the feasibility or practicality of arms control and disarmament; he does not place much faith in the United Nations. He feels we are still in a primitive condition with respect to the government of the world; that we must rely primarily on our national strength, and not turn to international institutions for the solution of these very difficult problems.

I agree with the Senator from Washington in part. It would be folly to negotiate for lasting peace from anything except a position of strength; as long as the Russians and Chinese are armed, we, too, must stay armed. But there are indications that the Russians, who have come under far greater stresses and strains than we have, are ready for a detente, which would include not only a treaty in terms of arms control, but, afterwards, even substantial reductions, if we only could get out of Vietnam and stop the shooting.

I would like to see far greater emphasis placed on the establishment of international institutions; on the moving of the 18-nation Geneva Conference for arms control along the line of ironing out the differences in the proposal for complete arms control and disarmament, which was tabled on the one hand by the Soviet Union, and on the other hand by the United States, some time ago. I hope to see further progress made in that direction, and I hope it will be made at Geneva this year in terms of creating a non-proliferation nuclear treaty and a comprehensive test ban treaty, including underground as well as overhead tests.

I would hope to see the prevention of an insane race for the deployment of antiballistic missiles and a moving forward with international cooperation as opposed to international conflict.

I want to be fair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who is not here to defend himself; but I am sure in his heart he approves of the same objectives. However, I am afraid he does

not think it a feasible or pragmatic method of solving our problems in the world in which we live today. Therefore, he puts his reliance on weapons of destruction, and I put my reliance on the diplomatic weapons of peaceful negotiations.

This seems to be, in a very real sense, the major difference between those who feel we should be working harder for peace in Vietnam and a detente with the Soviet Union than we are and those who in their hearts still believe that the Soviet Union is the same implacable enemy, bent on world conquest, the destruction of capitalism and freedom all over the world, and that we must continue that same fight against communism, which, in my opinion, has now largely become obsolete, although again I say that it certainly has not been entirely done away with. But the opportunity exists now for us to move toward a detente and away from conflict. I would hope we could see it that way in terms of the war in Vietnam as well as in our relations all over this constantly shrinking one world.

In this regard, I should like to quote a comment by former Ambassador Kennan in the testimony he gave before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under the general heading of "The Communist World in 1967," a subject with respect to which I think we all agree he is one of the greatest living authorities. He said, as shown beginning on page 56 of these hearings:

Well, it is true that I think we have worried about a great many more things than we needed seriously to worry about in recent years or at least that we have felt it necessary to take action in more situations than we needed to take action in. I think that we must realize that this world is not going to be without violence—not in our time, not in any time that we can conceive of. There is going to be a great deal in the way of internal violence within various countries. There is going to be violence between them. There is no slogan that I think is more false than the one that the Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov used to peddle about in the 1930s that peace is indivisible. Peace is obviously not indivisible.

We have seen numbers of wars that have been isolated, numbers of armed conflicts that have not led to the use of arms.

It seems to me our first concern here should be to prevent any war with weapons of mass destruction that we conceivably can prevent. This is our first duty, it is a duty to our children first and then to ourselves. But it is a duty that everybody should care about.

Beyond that I think we should strive for world stability, and try to reduce violence to a minimum, but be extremely careful about trying to distinguish morally between the two sides in the various conflicts that we see beyond our borders.

I interject at that point to say that I believe one of the serious errors that can be made in connection with the conflict in Vietnam is making a determination as between the "goodies" and the "baddies"; that the South Vietnamese are the "goodies," and the Vietcong are the "baddies," supported by the "big baddie," Ho Chi Minh, and Hanoi.

To me, this is a superficial and immature approach to the whole problem which exists in that country.

I return to quote Ambassador Kennan:

As a rule the issues of these conflicts are not identifiable with our own ideals anyway. And it is a great mistake to think that the devils are all on one side or the angels on the other. We have had a tendency to exaggerate the enmity of our enemies, and to exaggerate the friendliness of our friends. In international affairs there is always, as I said in my initial statement, a degree of complication in relations between people.

I interpolate there again to stress that in my judgment, my good friend from Washington, who generally is supporting the State Department and Defense Department line, has fallen into the error of oversimplifying the conflict in Vietnam, and considering it clearly an issue of black and white or right and wrong. It is much more complex and more complicated than that, as I have been endeavoring to show today and on several occasions in the past.

I return to former Ambassador Kennan's statement:

Let's adjust to this, and then concentrate more than we have on our internal problems which, as I see it, are really in a very serious state. Let's be a little more willing to let things happen without our intervention in other parts of the world wherever it does not seem as though world peace would be threatened thereby.

I think the main thing is to try to bring about, as I have said, stability, to restrict violence, not to put ourselves in a position where we have to interfere every time the guns begin speaking anywhere.

We have done something—I say "we" meaning the international community—which is extremely dangerous in one way, and that is we have authorized the establishment of literally dozens of new states, composed of peoples without experience in the sense of a national identity, in many instances with a scarcely sufficient educated class to mount a government.

Now, we mustn't expect that this is not going to have many adverse effects, or that all that results is going to be stable. These countries are simply not going to become mature and established and peaceful members of the international community like some of the older small nations of Europe within our time. We have to allow for that.

I think we should try to help them avoid armed conflicts. We should try to help them with their problems of developing within limits.

But we have to be careful about shouldering their entire burdens in any of these things, and about espousing their causes.

I interject that our failure to heed that sound advice is the principal reason we are in so much trouble today in South Vietnam. We have shouldered, or attempted to shoulder, practically the entire burden of the Government of South Vietnam. We have espoused their cause without giving any very careful consideration to whether or not it is a just cause. I suggest that we have deceived ourselves by identifying the war as one of aggression from the north on the south, whereas in point of fact the civil war began as long ago as 1958, and the intervention from the north did not occur until 1964; so that for 6 years it was a civil war, fought by South Vietnamese against South Vietnamese, with, of course, on both sides many Vietnamese from the north—because we must never forget that Vietnam is really all one country. The 17th parallel is an arti-

ficial division, created by the Geneva Conference for temporary purposes, and was not intended to last for more than the 2 years between 1954 and 1956.

I continue to read from Ambassador Kennan. Having referred to our shouldering their entire burden, he says, in concluding the particular colloquy:

I can't repeat too often one thing that I cited last year when I spoke before this committee, a sentence from John Quincy Adams, where he said even where other peoples' causes masquerade under the banner of freedom we had better not be tempted to take part in them. It is apt to prove that it just isn't just quite that way.

We should have learned the lesson when Diem betrayed democracy, but we did not. Now we shall have to learn it all over again when General Ky betrays democracy.

I turn now to page 61 of the same hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, at which Ambassador Kennan was testifying, and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] was engaged in colloquy with him.

The Senator said:

Mr. Kennan, in the years that you were involved in policy planning—

I interpolate that Ambassador Kennan was at one point the very brilliant director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Kennan, in the years that you were involved in policy planning, the years when you observed the development of plans with reference to the Far East, was there any time, when it was accepted that putting troops in southeast Asia was a part—was within the defense perimeter of the United States.

Mr. KENNAN. Not to my knowledge.

Senator McCARTHY (continuing). When that concept was current, within or on the perimeter?

Mr. KENNAN. My recollection is that this was in earlier years never accepted at all as a principle of American policy. I don't believe from my talks with General MacArthur that he ever envisaged a situation in which we would want to put troops on the mainland, outside of Korea, and I can assure you that in such planning as I was connected with in the immediate posthostility period running down to 1950—again excepting Korea which was a responsibility we had through the surrender of Japan and which occupied a special place—outside of that, I don't think anyone ever thought that any national interest that we had in the mainland of Asia was such that we might put troops there.

Senator McCARTHY. What about the point of view of those who were concerned with the containment of China by the United States? Did any of them contemplate that the containment of China depended upon our maintaining strength in this area of Southeast Asia?

Mr. KENNAN. No, they did not. I think the general view at this time was that we had a vital interest in seeing to it that the Japanese and Philippine archipelagos remained in reasonably friendly and reliable hands. We also had an interest of a negative sort in Formosa and in Okinawa.

Senator McCARTHY. So that the arguments that both the defense of the United States and the containment of China are somehow closely related to what we do in Southeast Asia are relatively new arguments?

Mr. KENNAN. Yes.

Senator McCARTHY. They are not in the longtime plans or projections?

Mr. KENNAN. I think that is correct.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Kennan, do you

know of anyone—back at the time when we first committed advisers in Vietnam—who actually said that this might develop into the kind of commitment that we now have?

Mr. KENNAN. No, although I am sure that there were people who viewed what we did at that time with a certain amount of apprehension. I can remember that on one occasion, when one of my colleagues came to me at the time of the crisis in Greece, when the Greeks were faced with a guerrilla movement, and suggested that we ought to put troops in, I had to reply to him that the experience of our intervention in Russia in 1918 and 1919 would suggest we should never put troops into such a situation unless we could see in advance how and when we were going to get them out again.

I interpolate that at the time President John F. Kennedy made his statement to which I referred earlier this afternoon, to the effect that it was the South Vietnamese people's war to win or, indeed, to lose, we had only 12,000 combat troops in South Vietnam.

We now have upward of 400,000, and very little of anything more to show for it except a rising list of American casualties and the other disadvantages of the war in South Vietnam to which I intend to refer after I offer my amendment tomorrow in a speech which I shall entitle "What Price Glory."

I read again from the statement of Ambassador Kennan:

Well, I wasn't the only person who held such views. I am sure there were many people who had misgivings about seeing us commit soldiers to combat in a confused situation of this nature before we could see at what point we were going to be able to extract them again.

Senator McCARTHY. Do you know of anyone who had that apprehension who said nonetheless we ought to put them in?

I am trying to find somebody who said, "If we put them in this is the way we ought to be doing it, and I am in favor of it."

We find lots of them saying, "I didn't think it would go this way and if I thought it were going to go this way I wouldn't be in favor of it."

Mr. KENNAN. It seems to me most people in a responsible position three or four years ago were saying we never should have put them in there. It is very difficult to understand how we got to where we got.

Senator McCARTHY. Wouldn't it be better to find someone who said, "I knew it was going to go this way and I was for it," than to find somebody who said, "I didn't think it would go this way or I wouldn't be for it."

But there is evidently nobody who conceived that it might go this way and who said, "We have got to do it anyway."

Mr. KENNAN. I can't think of anyone.

Mr. President, that takes me back to a concept which I have long accepted as our wise military and diplomatic posture with respect to Asia. I believe it is a posture which would be agreed upon by most thoughtful interpreters of our history in the wise use of our power.

Let us remember that when the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, there was nobody in the United States who thought that the Pacific was an American sea. We had only outposts at Wake Island and Guam and the Marianas, and they had relatively minor fortifications and very few troops to defend them.

Honolulu and the Hawaiian Islands were our outposts in the Pacific—one-third of the way across that vast ocean.

There suddenly came Pearl Harbor

and World War II, and we found ourselves pledged to the defeat of Japan, a Pacific power.

The French went back into southeast Asia. The Dutch went back into Malaysia, and the British went back into Malaysia and Hong Kong.

It has always been my view, then and now, that that was the problem of the colonial powers of Western Europe, and if they were able to maintain their positions as colonial powers, that was not our affair. If the natives decided to throw them out and become independent, that was none of our affair either.

It was my view that the outmost edge of the wise American policy was to draw a periphery down the island chain, starting with Japan—and I would not have included Korea—and running around Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, the Indonesian archipelago, Malaysia—being then a British hegemony—with Australia and New Zealand to back them, and that we would then be able to deploy in support of our diplomacy the military power in which we excel: naval and air power.

We would be under no temptation to put American ground troops to fight on Asian land. I think that was a serious mistake, and I hope in due course that, having settled the Vietnam conflict on a basis honorable to ourselves and fair to our allies in South Vietnam, we will withdraw and never go back to the mainland of Asia.

I completely agree with Ambassador Kennan and most regretfully, in opposition to the thesis advanced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

In that connection, I reiterate that, in my judgment, the balance of power is a dangerous doctrine in a nuclear age and should not be injected by us in South Vietnam where, in many ways, particularly since the current chaos in China and the apparent willingness of the Soviet Union to see peace terms sought after and negotiations commenced, there is no long-term threat to whatever balance of power there may be in southeast Asia which could not be adequately handled by our diplomacy supported by our air and naval power based on the island chain, to which I have just referred.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] then discussed with considerable force and clarity the importance of our relations with the Soviet Union. I agree with the Senator from Washington that those relations are important. Perhaps they are more important than even the Senator from Washington thinks.

I agree with the Senator from Washington that the U.S.S.R. has great capabilities, economic and military.

The Senator from Washington speaks of the Soviet Union having broken its word in Laos. The Senators can recall that in the Vienna meeting, not too long after his inauguration, President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev purported to make a deal with respect to Laos but were unable to make a deal with respect to Vietnam, and that the Pathet Lao, supported from Hanoi, broke that agreement to which it was never a party.

The Soviet Union has been charged—and I will not say without justice—with having broken its commitment.

My own suggestion is that it was perhaps a commitment that they did not have the power to keep and that therefore they should never have made it.

I suspect that Mr. Khrushchev thought he had a great deal more influence with Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh than it turned out he had.

I would not myself accept the fact that that arrangement between Kennedy and Khrushchev was broken on the Communist side as uncontroversial evidence of bad faith on the part of the Russians. I think it is evidence of the fact that their reach exceeded their grasp and that they made a commitment which they were unable to fulfill on the ground.

The Senator asked:

Is the Soviet anxious to bring the war in Vietnam to an end?

When I was in the Soviet Union last November and had a long talk with First Deputy Foreign Minister Kuznetsov, a man who incidentally speaks excellent English and who was educated at the Carnegie School of Engineering in my own State, in the city of Pittsburgh, he was tough.

He indicated that the Soviet Union would not in any way intervene to help bring hostilities in Vietnam to a close. He reiterated the famous four points of the Hanoi government.

He referred to that government as "our Socialist allies whom we must protect and defend."

I left Moscow quite discouraged, believing that the Soviet Union was not interested in peace in Vietnam; that perhaps, like the Chinese Communists, they would like to have the war continue until the death of the last American, without any commitment of troops on the part of either China or Russia, although, of course, there were massive commitments of equipment and materiel.

If I have correctly read the newspapers in the last few weeks, the whole situation has changed. I was particularly interested that that change in situation has been perceptively noted by an able reporter who hitherto has been one of the great hawks of all time, a belligerent hawk, who appears to obtain from the Pentagon information that nobody else can get, and who has written so often in the past of the need for total military victory in Vietnam. I refer, of course, to the well-known columnist Joseph Alsop, who wrote several columns in recent days or weeks, indicating that he has changed his mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the *Record* the column entitled "The Big Blink in London," written by Joseph Alsop, and published in this morning's *Washington Post*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE BIG BLINK IN LONDON
(By Joseph Alsop)

What happened in London ten days ago, between the British and Soviet Prime Ministers, was very much more important than anyone has as yet admitted in public. Facts have been published, but in a manner three quarters shorn of meaning.

Briefly, Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin went to London with a lingering hope that

this country might still be induced to "stop the bombing to get talks" about Vietnam.

More specifically, he hoped to persuade the British to change their stand, and to join in the pressure that the Soviets had been so persistently applying since September.

Kosygin's aim had been foreseen in Washington. Chester Cooper, one of the ablest members of Governor Averell Harriman's "peace task-force," was therefore sent over very inconspicuously, just before the Kosygin visit, to give Prime Minister Harold Wilson the very latest details of the situation as seen here in Washington.

In the outcome, the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary George Brown refused to be budged from their position that the President was quite reasonable to refuse a bombing halt without some sort of reciprocal action by Hanoi. Whereupon—and here is the vital meaningful development—the Soviet Premier took the wholly new tack of trying to budge Hanoi.

For this purpose, the Soviet government, at Kosygin's request, officially urged the Hanoi government to take quite important reciprocal action, in order to secure the desired bombing halt and the opening of negotiations. After long delays (during which Harold Wilson has confessed that he thought peace was "within grasp") the Hanoi leaders refused to heed Moscow's urgings.

But Hanoi's obstinacy was really less significant than Moscow's new flexibility. When one partner is deeply and painfully engaged, and another partner is merely giving aid and comfort, the engaged partner is always bound to meet the first suggestion that he cut his losses with an initial show of obstinacy. The thing to note, in fact, is that Moscow has begun to give this kind of advice.

This means, first, that Hanoi's partners in Moscow now judge that the war is going very badly for Hanoi. It means, second, that Moscow seriously wants the war ended as soon as possible. Without such compelling reasons, Kosygin would never, indeed could never have done what he did.

One informed judge has remarked that "the Soviets were formerly trying to find a way out that would save America's face. Now they are trying to find a way out that will save Hanoi's face." Maybe that is putting it a bit high; but the fact remains that in Dean Rusk's terminology, there was a big blink in London, though a blink at second hand, to be sure.

The Wilson-Kosygin conversations had some other vividly interesting aspects. Quite spontaneously, for instance, and to all appearances quite disinterestedly, Premier Kosygin strongly advised Prime Minister Wilson to remain solidly faithful to his American Alliance, whatever Gen. de Gaulle might say about it. The United States, Kosygin implied, mattered immeasurably more than France.

Again, Premier Kosygin had the frankness to admit, at one point, that no less than 100,000 North Vietnamese are now at the front in South Vietnam. This figure means that just about one half of the Vietcong—indeed, rather more than half, according to the enemy documents newly captured in the "Cedar Falls" operation—are now invaders from the North.

The figure is far higher than any the U.S. Intelligence has ever used. It points to serious deterioration of the Vietcong's structure and popular support in the South; for such an enormous Northern presence can only reflect an urgent need. It fits, in short, with what Kosygin did in London.

One may be quite certain, moreover, that what Kosygin did in London was only a beginning. Such new departures are always beginnings, never ends. It is a ten-to-one bet, therefore, that new approaches to peace in Vietnam are now being jointly explored, in some back room or other, by Soviet and American representatives.

This does not mean that an end is already

in sight—although it just could be. It is also a situation demanding maximum American self-possession. To budge Hanoi at last, maximum pressure must be maintained at the front; yet in outlining possible settlement terms, the most generous moderation must also be shown. It will be criminal if the first "smell of victory," as Walter Lippmann has put it, is allowed to cause intoxication-from-success.

That fact remains that if we are both resolute and generous, an end may yet be in sight before most people have dared to imagine.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to lapse briefly into Latin: *Mirabile dictu*—the hawk has lost his claws.

Mr. Alsop starts his column by saying that what happened 10 days ago in London between Kosygin and Wilson was very important, indeed. Kosygin went to London, hoping that the United States could be induced to "stop bombing to get talks" about Vietnam. When he found that could not be done, much to Mr. Alsop's surprise—and perhaps this is true; who knows?—the Soviets promptly took a whole new tack and tried to budge Hanoi, to get them to the negotiating table.

I do not say that Mr. Alsop is the law of the Medes and the Persians; I do not even identify him with the Code of Hammurabi or with the Constitution of the United States. I am lost for further analogies. But I think it is interesting when this hawkier of the hawks writes:

It is a 10-to-1 bet, therefore, that new approaches to peace in Vietnam are now being jointly explored, in some back room or other, by Soviet and American representatives.

This does not mean that an end is already in sight—although it just could be. It is also a situation demanding maximum American self-possession.

With that, I thoroughly agree.

To budge Hanoi at last, maximum pressure must be maintained at the front.

With that I disagree.

Yet in outlining possible settlement terms, the most generous moderation must also be shown.

I should like to see some generous moderation as opposed to the further escalation. I note from the newspapers this morning that we have again moved to escalating the war by dropping mines from aircraft into the rivers of North Vietnam, and are further escalating by moving in artillery to shell North Vietnam across the demilitarized zone. We are also moving our warships in to shell North Vietnam targets in a new blow at the supply trail to the south. These are actions which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, told me on Thursday he did not know were even contemplated.

So we see, as Ambassador Goldberg goes to the Far East on a mission to explore possibilities for peace, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have moved in, as they have moved so often before, with a further escalation of military action. Senators will remember that it has now been revealed that back on the 12th and 13th of last December, Hanoi was ready to say that if the United States called off its bombing, Hanoi would go to the

negotiating table. Before the words could come out of their mouths, we bombed Hanoi and killed a number of civilians right in the middle of the city. Oh, surely, it was said to be an accident. Oh, surely, we did not mean to kill civilians. We were after some military target, the nature of which I do not remember at the moment.

So now, when possibly again, according to one of the great hawks in our country, peace may be just around the corner, we choose to escalate the war for another time.

I am concerned as to what the administration is up to. The President talks a fine game of peace; and frankly, I believe him. I think he wants peace as much as anyone else in the United States today. But just as there seems to be a pretty good chance of getting peace, just as he receives a signal—almost any signal—that Hanoi is ready to talk, our military takes over and escalates the war, and if for no other reason than because of a loss of face—a vice not confined to the Oriental mind; many Americans, I think, also practice that vice—and the chance for peace has gone out the window.

I wonder who is doing all this. I wonder why it is that the military do not seem to be under that control of our civilian government which is the basis of our whole democracy. I will say again, as I have said many times before, that, in my judgment, the military ought to be kept on tap, not on top. But they wriggle out of the tap time after time and seem to get on top just at the time when their activities strike a serious blow against peace.

I was startled on Saturday morning of last week, when I was back in my hometown of Philadelphia, Pa., to see a four-column spread on the front page of the Philadelphia Inquirer, our great morning newspaper. The headline was:

U.S. Calls Peace Effort a Failure, Says War is Only Vietnam Course.

Who told the Philadelphia Inquirer that? I do not know. Let me read a little further:

From Our Wire Services. Washington, February 24—U.S. officials said Friday that peace efforts made this month have collapsed and—barring a change of position by Hanoi—a military solution is the only way of ending the Vietnam War.

What U.S. officials? Faceless men, again; a reiteration of that wicked maxim—I use the word advisedly—by which anonymous little men, usually at intermediate positions in either the State Department, the Defense Department, or the Armed Services, leak stories to anonymous reporters from our wire services.

A scare four-column headline appears in a great metropolitan daily to lead the American people to believe that the chances of peace are gone.

U.S. officials said the response from Hanoi to the meeting in London of Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin in effect was, "Go to hell."

What U.S. officials were using that somewhat vulgar language is not disclosed in the article. Certainly, Mr.

Alsop does not appear to believe that. I wonder who was responsible.

U.S. officials said that North Vietnam had concentrated major forces in and about the demilitarized zone at the 17th parallel.

There were no assurances given by Hanoi that these forces would not be sent across the demilitarized zone into South Vietnam if the United States halted the bombing of the North.

(At this point, Mr. SPONG took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, here we have a war scare created anonymously by faceless men. I deplore this and I intend to ask the Department of Defense and the Department of State to see if they can find out who these anonymous men are. The Philadelphia Inquirer, of course, will protect its sources. That is proper newspaper procedure. But this sort of thing is vicious and there should be a way to stop it, particularly when it comes at a time when many persons, in addition to Mr. Alsop, think if we behave with that wise maturity which Ambassador Kennan counseled us to follow, we may be much closer to peace now in this area than we have been for a long time, and perhaps close to it.

Mr. President, that is why it is a wise thing to have a far-ranging debate on the pending business. I hope tomorrow and the next day that many Senators will rise and express their views on what I have said, what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] has said today, what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said last week, and what the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] said on Friday.

Mr. President, I think it is high time that we brought these problems into the open and that we had a wide-ranging debate. Perhaps the amendments which I and Senator HARTKE filed—and he played his part in the debate on Friday, also—will provide the vehicle for such a debate.

Mr. President, I say, in answer to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in my judgment and the judgment of Mr. Alsop—an unusual ally for my point of view—the Soviet Union is anxious to bring the war in Vietnam to an end. I believe the consensus is that Soviet policy has changed since I was in Moscow in the middle of last November—for which I am glad, if it is true—and we should explore to determine if it is true.

I am gratified by the fact that Ambassador Thompson, that wise diplomat, has returned to Moscow. I have no doubt that he is even now exploring the possibilities of peace which might develop from a Soviet change of mind.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] refers to the antiballistic missiles and their alleged deployment by the Soviet Union. He indicates his grave concern that we might let down our guard and not follow suit, even though following suit would cost us in the neighborhood of \$40 billion, and without civil defense shelters which would have to be constructed and made available to our people in the relatively small number of cities where \$40 billion would provide

some kind of inadequate antiballistic missile defense.

The Senator puts his emphasis on a strong defense. I cannot disagree with him, for I, too, think that within limits we should have a strong defense until, negotiating from strength, we are able to arrive at a detente, which is so clearly in the interest of both the Soviet Union and the United States.

The Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has as its chairman the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and on which I have the honor to serve, is presently conducting hearings on the antiballistic-missile problem. Of course, much of that testimony is classified. I am not at liberty to reveal it, but from what I have heard I do not have the slightest doubt that newspaper stories, which I have read to the effect that there is no such thing nor will there be in the foreseeable future a foolproof antiballistic missile system, are correct. Nothing we have, the Nike X or the Nike-Zeus, could prevent any one of our cities from being destroyed by a massive attack. The information I have received is that this is true of the Soviet Union's antiballistic missile defense.

I hope that wise and enlightened diplomacy will succeed. I know that our diplomats are trying hard to persuade the Soviet Union to call off this expenditure for a system which will not work and the future tax of the economy would perhaps bring it close to the breaking point.

The Senator says that we need to remember the art of doing two things at once. I agree with that. Possibly Theodore Roosevelt was right when he said: Speak softly and carry a big stick. We are going to carry that stick a while longer. Let us speak softly. Let us appreciate that there is a good chance, indeed, that the posture of the Soviet Union has changed; that they are now as anxious to move toward a detente as we are if we can only get the shooting stopped in Vietnam.

I commend the Senator from Washington for his support of the consular treaty with Russia. I think he showed wise statemanship, particularly when one remembers his inherent suspicions of the intentions of the Soviet Union and the speculation on the wide range of intentions of that country. I think he showed wisdom and maturity by stating he believed that the consular treaty should be ratified as the first step toward what could turn into a wide ranging detente.

I would hope that the Senator from Washington—and I have not abandoned hope—would join some of the rest of us in urging reciprocal reduction of military power by the Soviet Union and ourselves. That action is needed and it is needed before we break into open conflict because, as with children playing with tin soldiers and little guns in the sand, we have to commit those toys to use to see if they work. We are fortunate indeed, that that has not yet happened.

The Senator from Washington notes that there have been some hopeful signs in connection with East-West relations in Europe. Having recently returned from that part of the world I believe we

should capitalize on them in terms of the splendid speech which was made on October 7, 1966, by President Johnson, when he indicated his desire to build bridges between the nations of Eastern Europe, Western Europe, and ourselves.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] said:

We want to encourage more by standing ready to cooperate with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union when cooperation is possible and by standing quietly but firmly on the ready in case our will is once again put to the test in Berlin or elsewhere.

With that I thoroughly agree.

In the third part of the Senator's speech, he attributes the anti-Communist revolution in Indonesia to the strong military stand we took in South Vietnam. This must be a matter of judgment. My judgment is not in accord with that of the Senator from Washington. I believe that the revolution in Indonesia would have occurred because of the peculiar situation in that country, whether we had a single American soldier on the land mass of Asia in Vietnam. But, I cannot prove it, and he cannot prove it. This must be a question of judgment which I think, to some extent, reflects our varying points of view in the appropriate use of military power.

I quote from an article written by Seymour Topping and published in the New York Times, provided to me by the Library of Congress. On August 25 he writes:

Although some military men feel that United States action in Vietnam helped to shield Indonesia from Communist infiltration, the Jakarta government officials and public generally are opposed to the Vietnam policy of the Johnson Administration. Malik—

That is the Indonesian Foreign Minister—

believes that Asian security problems should be solved by the Asians themselves on the basis of regional cooperation.

Malik is one of the triumvirate which is presently governing Indonesia. He, Malik, says that Indonesia will join in developing Southeast Asia regional organizations, but he feels that in their early stages such groups should exercise economic rather than military action.

Mr. President, Mr. Malik came to Washington on September 27, 1966, and he treaded carefully on the Vietnam issue. In an obvious effort to avoid complicating current aid for Indonesia negotiations, he took a guarded stand in favor of a cessation of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam at a news conference reported in the Washington Post on September 28, 1966.

Thus, I suggest that the consensus of available information would be that the Indonesians, after their anti-Communist revolution—and for that matter, before it—did not believe that our intervention in South Vietnam was of any particular assistance to their cause.

Let me point out that Indonesia is one of three countries which got rid of its Communists without the aid of a single American soldier. The other two countries were Burma and the Philippines.

Perhaps we would do better if we utilized our diplomacy, and perhaps the

Peace Corps, to aid the economic advancement of these countries through our aid program rather than landing soldiers on their shores to kill the natives in an effort to give them the freedom which they know little, if anything, about.

The Senator said that "to know Red China is to fear its ambitions."

Perhaps Red China has bellicose intentions toward the other nations of Southeast Asia. They have had them for thousands of years and they have never been able to take over yet. But, I wonder, under current conditions, whether Red China has the capability of moving any soldiers very far south of its own borders.

I am certainly no military expert, but everything I have been able to read and to hear is to the effect that certainly since the recent chaos overtook Communist China—and probably before then—they had great defensive capability; one would be unwise to attempt to invade Red China; but their offensive capability was slight, indeed. Their adventures into Tibet and on the borders of India are not evidence to the contrary.

The Senator also refers to opinion in Japan. He says in effect:

There has been a remarkable shift of opinion in Japan as that country has watched the hard line followed by Peking in Vietnam and in international affairs generally.

I interpolate to say that Japan has watched the hard line which we have taken in South Vietnam since we put massive American forces and firepower in there to the tune of hundreds of thousands of men in the spring and summer of 1965.

Japan—

Continues the Senator from Washington—

was at first very critical of the American buildup in Vietnam. We know the good historical reasons why this should be so. But today there is open discussion in Japan, inconceivable two years ago, of the importance to Japan of keeping ready access to the markets of Southeast Asia and not having an unfriendly power in control of the Straits of Malacca. It has not been lost to the Japanese that the United States has no territorial ambitions in North Vietnam or in Vietnam at all, that it is willing to permit the Communist government in the northern half of the country to continue and that it has hoped to bring about a degree of political stability in the south.

This may well be true, but let me quote from the testimony of our very able former Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Reischauer, given a couple of weeks ago before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—actually it was January 31 of this year—on the subject of Asia, the Pacific, and the United States.

Note this carefully:

Mr. REISCHAUER. The Japanese public is very much afraid that America may be following the unhappy course Japan took in the 1930s and 1940s in its relationships with China, and that is one of the reasons for the strong public reaction to our Vietnam policies in Japan, because they see us following an essentially military course that might get us further and further involved with these great masses of people on the Asian continent, and they learned them-

selves that they cannot be controlled by military means.

I do not think we are doing that—

Says Ambassador Reischauer, and I interject there to say that I think we are doing just that.

Ambassador Reischauer continues:

I do not think we are doing that, but this is what the Japanese think we may be getting into.

THE CHAIRMAN. I have been told the Japanese approve of what we are doing down there. Would you elaborate a bit on that?

Mr. REISCHAUER. This is a very complicated thing to talk about, because, after all, there are 100 million Japanese with different points of view.

The Government which, of course, has close contacts with us, and has had a dialog with us all along, I think understands our position fairly well and has tended to say that it understood. That is the strongest phrase they used in giving us their support there. They have never quite dared to say that they support us because there is a great deal of opposition to our policies on the part of the general public in Japan.

I think the average Japanese would be worried if we were to pull out.

So would I, without a sensible and honorable peace.

Continuing to read from Mr. Reischauer's testimony:

They would see this as leading to great disruption in the whole of southeast Asia, and they have much greater interests there than we do, so they do not want to see that happen.

And neither do I, but I want to see us stay and withdraw gradually, after a just peace and some contribution on our part to reviving the economy which we have played so large a part in wrecking.

On the other hand—

Says the Ambassador—

they have an instinctive revulsion at seeing what is essentially a Caucasian nation with superior weapons fighting Asian people without those weapons, and they identify themselves naturally with the people being bombed, and this is not surprising, because we bombed Japan ourselves 21 years ago, and so they think of themselves more in terms of bombees rather than bombers.

So I, with great reluctance, cannot agree with my friend from Washington in his analysis of Japanese opinion.

The Senator from Washington says we seek a limited victory; and I agree with that, too. He says it is obtainable. I believe it is obtainable, but not by military means. We need political action, and not a military solution, to bring this war to an honorable end.

The word must go through diplomacy, and not by force of arms. Are we succeeding?

I have tried to make a record with respect to that earlier this afternoon. I suggest that while it may be that our military efforts are beginning to become more successful than they were in the past, all the indications of military strength suggest we are not any closer to the subjugation of the Vietcong and the pacification of South Vietnam than we were at the time the infiltration started and the guerrilla warfare commenced. All the massive strength of the

United States of America, deployed in that country, now for more than 18 months, has had very little impact.

I cannot help remembering so well that General Harkins and General Taylor, and even Secretary of Defense McNamara, have said it is almost over, that we are winning, that the war is coming to an end. The Secretary once promised even to bring the boys home by Christmas 1965. General Taylor once indicated that in 3 or 4 months, from the time he spoke, the war would be won.

We all know the story of the little boy who ran into the village and cried "wolf." This is the reverse of the situation in Vietnam. The story goes that each time the little boy cried "wolf," the village men ran out with their sticks and other weapons, and the little boy roared with laughter, because there was no wolf. Are we going to continue to accept the military's word when they predict victory? We started doing it many years ago and here it is the winter of 1967. So I suggest we remember that, when we hear that recent military operations have taken a turn for the better and that Hanoi is about to give up and the Vietcong about to return to their destroyed villages. As one Senator, I will believe it when I see it. I hope I am wrong. I hope the military is right. But I must admit that past experience does not give one much confidence in its predictions.

I want to say a word about the bombing. The Senator from Washington appears to believe that the bombing of the north has had at least a perceptible, if not a significant, effect in curtailing infiltration from the south; and perhaps he has evidence to sustain that position, but, from what I have been able to learn from the hearings held before the Armed Services Committee, there is no such contention on the part of the military.

At page 73 of the hearings, Secretary McNamara is quoted as having said:

I believe that the campaign against the north has been successful, and I say that for two reasons. First, because the objectives were just exactly what you say has been accomplished, to increase the morale of the south.

At what cost do we increase the morale of General Ky and his military and air force cohorts?

I resume reading what Secretary McNamara said:

Everybody will agree to that. Second, to increase the cost to the north of infiltration to the south.

Note carefully, not to stop it, but to increase its cost. He then continues:

Roughly 200,000 to 300,000 people in the north have been diverted from other activities to, in effect, repairing the damage to the lines of communication caused by our bombing. So the cost to infiltrate these limited quantities of men and equipment to the south has increased dramatically.

Third, to raise the political price paid by the north to continue the campaign in the south, and as you pointed out, that has definitely been done. So I would say those were the stated objectives we had in mind and we have accomplished them.

The second reason I say it's a success is that there isn't anything they would like to

get rid of more at the moment, that I can tell, than the bombing [deleted]. So for both of those reasons I think it has been a success.

Now note this:

But I never believed in the past, and I don't believe today, that air bombardment on any acceptable scale will stop or significantly reduce the movement of such small numbers of men and such small quantities of material as are being sent from the north to the south.

Are they, then, so small? We have been told various figures at different times: 3,500 a month; 7,500 a month; a total, according to our last count, of 45,000 last year, plus possibly 26,000 more who have not been actually identified.

I charge that North Vietnam can send just exactly as many people into South Vietnam as it wants to, and if it has not sent any more, it is not because the bombing has stopped or even slowed them, but because it did not want to send any more. We all know Ho Chi Minh has a large, well trained army, which he has not committed to the south at all. Any time he wants to, in my opinion, he can.

I am not in a position to reveal the source of that statement, but I am convinced that it is correct.

So I would say that our diplomacy should be a little more skillful, and not so blundering; that we should have taken and should take all initiative and every opportunity to get negotiations started. If we have to stop the bombing again, to see if it will work, let us stop the bombing. If it does not work, we can always start the bombing again. But let us remember that the bombing does not do us much good. Even Secretary McNamara's statements, if we analyze them carefully, do not differ along those lines.

Let me read from another statement by the Secretary. It appears on page 57 of the hearings:

Undoubtedly the bombings do limit the capability of the North Vietnamese to infiltrate men and equipment into the south. I think just a priori one could arrive at that conclusion. But it is not clear that the limit that results is below the level that the North Vietnamese planned on, and in any event, it is not below the level necessary to support the force in the south at the present time.

Apparently Secretary McNamara there is saying that it is just the intentions of Hanoi, and not the bombing, that is curtailing infiltration into the south. They just do not want to send any more down there at the present time; and perhaps they are wise.

So I would suggest that a little more skillful diplomacy could be conducted, in the hope of getting together over the negotiating table, without threatening in any way the lives of "our boys in the jungles and the elephant grass," as so many of my fellow Senators love poetically to say from time to time, when they feel they do not want the bombing stopped.

I do not believe a single additional American boy's life would be in jeopardy if we stopped the bombing. I could be wrong. I do not know. This must be just an individual judgment. I know that former Senator Goldwater said recently that during the truce, the trucks were bumper to bumper from North

Vietnam to South Vietnam, carrying additional ammunition and materiel to kill our boys. I do not know whether anybody verified that comment, and I would be interested to see to what extent, if at all, during the truce, significant additional supplies or men were infiltrated from the north to the south. Again I say I might be wrong, and I shall await with interest a reply to that inquiry.

The complaint is made that Russian mines and antiaircraft are being used against our shipping and our airplanes. But is this anything more than the opposite number of our bombing and our naval activity, and now our mining of the rivers of North Vietnam? What we have to get into our heads is that Soviet Russia is a natural ally of the Socialists in North Vietnam, to the same extent as we have become, to my way of thinking, a rather unnatural ally of the Ky government in South Vietnam; and to the extent that the two powers are engaged, of course, we are going to protect our friends. That has been the history of alliances and warfare since the beginning of time.

The Senator says that Hanoi could stop the bombing by stopping the infiltration. I wonder what the record of infiltration has been since the first of this year. I wait with interest some figures on that. It was not too long ago that the columnist, Joseph Alsop, averred that our bombing had pretty well dried up the infiltration of South Vietnam from the north. Yet, I repeat, highly responsible intelligence sources say that that is not so, and if the infiltration has leveled off, as perhaps it has—and I should like to know—I would suggest it is not because of the bombing, but because Ho Chi Minh decided he did not wish to commit any more regular troops to the south.

Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I welcome the speech of the Senator from Washington. It is a temperate speech. It does not wrap the flag around anyone. If one makes the basic assumptions of the Senator from Washington, it is a persuasive speech. I agree with much of it. But I suggest it ignores the larger picture which the witnesses before the Committee on Foreign Relations made plain in their testimony a few weeks ago. So I now turn to a brief discussion of that testimony. I believe I have already read into the Record most of what needs to be pointed out with respect to the testimony of Ambassador Kennan; but I did not mention what he had to say about the bombing.

I quote from page 59 of his testimony at the hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee on January 30. Senator COOPER asked him—and I shall skip the first part of the Senator's comment, because it is irrelevant:

Do you think cessation of bombing is worth the risk of our taking it?

MR. KENNAN. Yes.

Senator COOPER. Moving toward the possibility of negotiations?

MR. KENNAN. Senator Cooper, I don't feel that I am in a position to see all the factors that are involved in this situation. There are no doubt some that I can't judge from the information available to me. Also, in contrast, apparently, with a great many people who criticize violently what we are doing in Vietnam, I have a very high degree of

faith in the good will and the seriousness of the people who are guiding our policy.

I feel that their problems have not been easy ones. I don't share the feeling that they are idiots to have done what we have done. I think this has been a very, very difficult problem. They have given their explanations for the continuation of the bombing. I have not been fully persuaded by those explanations. Perhaps I am wrong; perhaps they are. But it has seemed to me that this is a very extravagant undertaking from the standpoint of the relationship between cause and effect, fantastically expensive for a relatively small result. It has certainly had adverse effects on world opinion. And it has required us repeatedly to decline to follow the very solemn urgings given us by such people as U Thant and Pope Paul.

These are not light considerations, you see. But in addition to this, it has divided our own opinion here at home in a very grievous manner.

And finally you have the fact that, as the administration admits, any operation of this sort is bound to bring a certain amount of loss of innocent civilian life. Now, this is something we, all of us, in the light of our own ideals and national ideals and personal feelings can only regret profoundly.

I interject that it is not only the cause of substantial loss of life among civilians; it is the cause of significant loss of life to American boys who are flying the planes and being shot down and killed or burned to death, or taken prisoner and perhaps tortured. So the cost is even greater, in my book, than Ambassador Kennan's statement indicates.

The Ambassador continues:

So for all these reasons, it seems to me that the burden of proof is on those who say that this operation must continue.

I would not like to risk the statement that if we were to stop doing it there would immediately be some reciprocal action either by Ho or by the Russians. I don't know whether there would or wouldn't.

Neither do I.

He continued:

I personally would feel more comfortable about our position, whether there was or whether there wasn't.

Then Senator COOPER said, to paraphrase his statement, "I do not know the answer to these imponderables, either," and continued:

But even knowing all, these questions cannot be answered, yet the hope of negotiations could make it worthwhile to make the effort.

Mr. KENNAN. Yes; the answer is affirmative.

I turn now to the testimony of Ambassador Reischauer, who testified on January 31. For the record, this is Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer, who served in Japan with such distinction for many years, and is now back in this country as a professor at Harvard University.

Senator CASE asked him, as quoted on page 56, a question which referred to escalation and the dangers in it and the dangers of the bombing. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] expressed his personal concern about the bombing.

The Ambassador replied:

My observation is that the dangers of escalation are the ones that press upon us

for the moment, but the other one might be very, very serious, and I was really arguing against these two possibilities.

I do not have any good solution to the present war in Vietnam, as no one else has. We do not really know. I would tend to agree with your view that our hope of bringing about negotiations and forcing the other person to the table by hitting him harder, by search and kill, which has not been too successful, particularly by bombing in the north, that these hopes have been proved to be wrong.

With that, I thoroughly agree. I continue to read from the statement by the Ambassador:

Psychologically, I think, they go against fundamental feelings. Remember the chip on the shoulder that any Asian has against us. The harder we push the more he wants to resist. This is not the way to get him to the table. I think we have much more hope of getting a negotiated settlement by getting hold of the population in the south through a clear and hold type of policy, particularly in the delta areas, and putting our greatest effort into trying to bring peace, stability, and eventually a buildup in those areas.

I state my disagreement with the commitment of American troops into the delta. I have already stated earlier this afternoon why I do not agree with Ambassador Reischauer in that regard.

The statement of Ambassador Reischauer continues:

Actually, one reason for not bombing the north or for trying to find a way to de-escalate that bombing, aside from the very high political costs we have paid around the world for this particular policy, is a psychological one. I think it would be easier for the other side to try to find a negotiated settlement when we are no longer doing that to them, and in that sense it would be a step toward negotiation.

With that, I thoroughly agree.

Ambassador Reischauer undertook to state the propositions on which to base our Pacific policy. I find myself in complete agreement with them, and since they have pertinence to the pending measure and to the amendments which I propose to offer tomorrow, I should like to read them into the Record. They appear at page 8 of Ambassador Reischauer's testimony. The title is: "Propositions on Which To Base Our Pacific Policy."

It reads:

Returning to the other Asian lands, I should like to put forward, on the basis of the broad concepts discussed above, a few general propositions, as indicative of the fundamental directions in which we should be trying to move over the years ahead. I cannot in the format of this brief presentation explore these propositions fully, but I believe they are concepts which should be studied carefully. Stated bluntly and with a minimum of justification or explanation, these propositions are:

1. We should seek to minimize our military involvement and military commitments in Asia, because our vital interests are not likely to be threatened in most of Asia, because our type of military strength is not very effective in meeting subversion and guerrilla warfare, which are the chief threats to the stability of most Asian countries, and because our military presence is likely to stir up anti-American reactions and have other influences adverse to our long-range interests.

It was heartening to me, who, in my really quite humble way, have been try-

ing to think through these problems for several years now, to find Ambassador Reischauer saying so much better than I could have said it exactly what I had come to believe.

His second point is:

We should not try to induce most Asian countries to align themselves formally with us, since such alignments do not add to our security and are not likely to be as effective in giving them security as their own unfettered nationalism and, possibly, regional groupings of like-minded countries. Far more useful, both to the security of most Asian nations and to our own, are multilateral involvements of these states with one another and with all the developed nations.

We tried to do that in the SEATO Treaty and we failed. It was not an effective instrument for Asia then and it is not now. We may be a long way from being able to create that kind of détente or line between south Asian countries. However, I suggest that the initiative should come from them and not from us, and perhaps that was the trouble with the SEATO Treaty, that we tried to jam it down their throats and it did not work.

I see China as a stirring and effective nationalism along with a number of Asian countries: Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. They seem now to be coming together in an arrangement among themselves which perhaps—but only perhaps—we should be prepared to support by air and naval power from the island chain I referred to earlier this afternoon and perhaps—but only perhaps—by very substantial economic aid.

I have a fear that our very useful foreign aid program—and I have been one of the relatively few Senators who have been strongly in support of it—is being distorted by the enormous emphasis placed on economic aid to Vietnam in contradistinction to aid to other countries which, in my opinion, need it far more and where, were it dispersed, the national security of the United States would be much better protected. I refer to the countries of Latin America where the Alliance for Progress seems to be faltering to some extent, and necessarily to India and Pakistan, Turkey to a lesser extent, Greece, Taiwan, and perhaps Korea, speaking in economic but not in military terms.

Ambassador Reischauer's third point is:

We should not sponsor political, social, or economic change in Asian countries, though we should be responsive to requests from them for aid in carrying out such changes whenever we judge that these changes would help in the healthy development of these countries and that our aid could usefully contribute to this end. We run serious and unwarranted dangers when we take the initiative in sponsoring important internal changes in Asian lands or when our influence becomes so preponderant that we assume responsibility for the existence or nature of a regime. Such situations are all too likely to produce serious friction between our well-meaning efforts and their nationalism.

If I could put that eloquent statement in blunter terms, I would say that we should mind our own business. We should not offer our particular brand of idealism to those who do not ask

for it. However, if we are asked and the request is sensible and in the best interest of ourselves and the asking country, we should then show that compassion and good Samaritanism which is so large a part of the American attitude toward the world during the history of our Republic.

The Ambassador's fourth point is:

We should not seek to play the role of leader in Asia, rallying allies to our policies, but should attempt to withdraw to the role of a friendly outside supporter of individual or collective Asian initiatives. In such a role, we are more likely to be able to give effective aid to Asian countries than when we assume the leadership ourselves.

I quote from page 9:

However, unless we have guiding propositions of this type clearly in mind, we cannot take steps in the right direction when opportunity does offer, and we run the risk of wandering even further afield from them.

I now turn to the testimony of Henry Steele Commager before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject "Changing American Attitudes Toward Foreign Policy." Mr. Commager testified on Monday, February 20, of this year. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] asked this question:

I would like to have your analysis of the proposal recently made that, as I understand it that, the United States would stop bombing of the north, of North Vietnam, if North Vietnam would cease supplying her soldiers and sending reinforcements and supplies to her soldiers, her armies, in South Vietnam.

Mr. Commager replied in terms of a letter he had written a few days earlier to the New York Times, expressing his views on the bombing. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1967]

BOMB PAUSE ARGUMENT CHALLENGED

TO THE EDITOR:

In his authoritative statement (Feb. 9) of the United States position on halting the bombing in North Vietnam, Secretary Rusk emphasized what has now become the central thesis of the American position: no bombing pause unless there is a reciprocal pause in North Vietnamese "infiltration." The Administration is by now so bemused with this argument that it advances it as if it were an axiom that cannot be challenged. But the two activities—bombing of North Vietnam and the movement of troops into South Vietnam, are neither reciprocal nor comparable.

During the past three years or so the United States has "infiltrated" something over four hundred thousand troops into South Vietnam; North Vietnam has "infiltrated" perhaps one-third or one-fourth this number. On top of our troop build-up, which more than matches the combined forces of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, we have embarked upon a program of bombing, and now rain down upon Vietnam more bombs than we dropped on Germany or Japan during any year of the great war.

COMPARABLE ACTION

The equivalent of a halt to the bombing is not a halt to North Vietnamese "infiltration." Such a halt would be logically matched by a comparable halt to the build-up and supply of U.S. forces in Vietnam. Secretary Rusk complained that North Vietnam took advantage of our two previous

bombing pauses to continue its "infiltration." But surely so did we. Indeed, all the evidence which we have suggests that during these pauses our own build-up went on at a faster rate than the North Vietnamese's.

The idea, so assiduously propagated, that if we halted the bombing we would somehow be left naked to the enemy, is unworthy of the spokesman of the most powerful nation on earth. The joint United States-South Vietnamese forces outnumber the joint Vietcong-North Vietnamese forces by something like three to one; their superiority in arms and equipment and all material of war is incomparably greater.

To halt the bombing would not put American soldiers at the mercy of the enemy, but might restore, for a moment, a faint semblance of parity between these contending forces. If, as seems clear, this is the price of peace negotiations, it is a price we can well afford to pay. [Editorial Feb. 14]

HENRY STEELE COMMAGER.

AMHERST, MASS., February 9, 1967.

(The writer is Winthrop H. Smith, Professor of American History at Amherst College.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Mr. Commager continued:

I do not, in fact, think that the equivalent of a cessation of bombing is a cessation of infiltration from the North. The fact is that we continue our infiltration and have done so from the beginning.

Statistics on troop strength, infiltration, and numbers killed in action, 1960-65, compiled from Department of Defense data

[Some figures have been rounded off]

	End of year—						
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
1. U.S. forces	800	3,000	11,000	16,000	23,000	184,000	1454,000
U.S. forces killed in action (267 total, 1961 through 1964)						1,369	5,008
2. South Vietnam's forces (national military forces) ¹	248,000	306,000	395,000	397,000	514,000	571,000	620,000
3. South Vietnamese forces killed in action	2,223	4,004	4,457	5,665	7,457	11,243	9,469
4. Other friendly forces						22,400	52,600
5. Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces	36,000	63,000	79,000	92,000	126,000	250,000	275,000
6. Vietcong and North Vietnamese killed in action	5,669	12,133	21,158	20,575	16,785	35,436	55,000
7. Infiltrations from the north	4,600	6,300	12,900	8,000	12,400	26,000	48,000

¹ Includes 35,000 U.S. forces in Thailand and 36,000 in naval forces operating in Vietnam area.

² Does not include paramilitary/security forces.

³ 26,000 North Vietnamese regulars.

⁴ 45,000 North Vietnamese regulars.

⁵ Total for "confirmed" and "probable." An additional 26,000 are listed as "possible."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Mr. Commager continues:

We have have built up our supplies, our materiel, all of these things, throughout the last three years at our various bombing pauses. We continue our build-up, we continue our infiltration of soldiers.

It seems to me most unfair to ask the other side to stop what they are doing while we continue that. The quid pro quo for cessation of infiltration is a cessation of our own build-up. The bombing is an extra, as it were. We launched it rather late in the day. It now seems to have gone on forever, but it did not go on up until 1965.

We launched it rather late in the day, and the proper relationship, a proper basis, I think, for a discussion, preliminary discussion, which might lead to a negotiated settlement is that we stop bombing and then that both sides, if possible, stop infiltrating, fighting, any kind of build-up.

If the North insists on continuing its build-up, we would continue our build-up as we now have a three-to-one majority in soldiers against the other side, and probably a ten-to-one superiority in arms and armaments of all kinds, and the comparable

Let us remember that we are a foreign power in Vietnam, and that North Vietnam at least has the excuse that they are coming to the aid of their countrymen, however we may deplore the way their countrymen are acting.

Mr. Commager continued:

The fact is that we continue our infiltration and have done so from the beginning; that although we do not use this word, it is a loaded word, we have, in effect, infiltrated something like 450,000 soldiers to Vietnam to, perhaps 100,000 I suspect less, from North Vietnam into the south.

Mr. Commager's suspicions are correct, according to the best figures that the Department of Defense has been able to furnish me. Infiltration into the south was 48,000 last year—with the possibility of 26,000 more—and 26,000 for 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table entitled "Statistics of Troop Strength, Infiltration, and Numbers Killed in Action," compiled by the Committee on Foreign Relations from data furnished by the Department of Defense.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

build-up would not be a serious drawback for the United States.

As I said earlier, the notion that we would somewhat be left naked to our enemies if we stopped bombing the North is an absurdity.

So that I do not see there any serious danger. I think it is clear, and it grows increasingly clear, with every statement that comes from us.

There was a letter in the Post today from Canada on this matter. It grows increasingly clear that there was some kind of signal from the North if we would, in fact, stop bombing for awhile, perhaps steps could be taken for discussions. This is a matter, of course, about which no layman has any accurate knowledge.

Mr. President, I wish I could do adequate justice to the testimony given by Mr. Commager. It was brilliant and, to me, absolutely persuasive. His statement is a long one—too long, I believe, to place in the RECORD. The colloquy with various members of the Committee on Foreign Relations was even longer. But the point of view expressed by Mr.

Commager with great eloquence is substantially the point of view I have advanced on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I concur in his comments, and I urge Senators to get copies of his statement from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I would urge them, if they feel so inclined, to read the colloquy also, because to me the Commager statement is a brilliant rebuttal of the policy this administration is following both with respect to Vietnam and China and, indeed, with respect to all of Southeast Asia—I will go even further and say: the policy we are following with respect to this constantly shrinking one world, concerning which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] addressed himself in his speech last week.

The title of Professor Commager's testimony is "Changing American Attitudes Toward Foreign Policy." I think he rendered a great educational service to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I hope to the Senate, and I hope to the country, because his primary concept was that the cold war can be ended; that international cooperation can be substituted for international conflict; that Vietnam is merely a symptom of the need to turn toward a détente with the Soviet Union and to offer the hand of friendship to Communist China, even though we know that that hand will not, for the foreseeable future, be accepted; to build those bridges between East and West, about which President Johnson spoke so eloquently in his October 7 address; and at least to give the Communists a chance to satisfy us that they know that their future as well as our future depends on peace, not war; that war in the modern world settles nothing, but exacerbates hate that can last for generations.

I had an opportunity, around the 18th or 19th of November last, to go to Poland. The Poles have a wonderful sense of humor. They are a brilliant people. They have been devastated and ravaged through the centuries by the Germans, the Austrians, and the Russians. Their independence and freedom have been taken away from them. They have come back, they have bounced back strongly, to become an independent nation again.

They still have a sense of humor. There is a story going around Warsaw to the effect that Adenauer, Gromyko, and Khrushchev all died and, believe it or not, they went to heaven. That is the unbelievable part of the story. When they got there, St. Peter greeted them cordially. This, I think, is also somewhat unlikely. He said to them, "Gentlemen, I give each of you one wish. What you want will be granted." He then asked Adenauer to state his wish.

Adenauer said, "I want to kill all the Russians." Khrushchev said, "I want to kill all the Germans." St. Peter said to Gromyko, "What do you want?" Well, said Gromyko, "Are you really going to grant these desires of my colleagues? This is not a very Christian thing to do."

St. Peter said, "That is true. They are harsh requests, but I have given my word and, therefore, I will, at the request of Chancellor Adenauer, kill all the Russians. I will, at the request of Premier

Khrushchev, kill all Germans. What do you want, Mr. Gromyko?" Gromyko said, "Under those circumstances, I would like to have a cup of coffee."

This story gives an idea of the hatred which still infests Europe. We are building up hatreds of our own in Asia today. It is a remarkable thing that the hatred between ourselves and the Japanese ended so quickly, and that the hatred between ourselves and the Germans ended so quickly. There never really was much hatred between us and the Italians. To me it is almost impossible to hate an Italian. I do not know how one can do it.

We have substituted hatred for communism and it has become nationalistic. So many hate the Russians and the Chinese, and they are not going to go away. St. Peter is not going to act on that basis when President Johnson goes to heaven, as I am sure he will. We better learn to get along with it and substitute, if we can, those lines I have recited so many times, "International cooperation for international conflict."

I wish to refer to four other extraordinarily fine witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the first of which was Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin:

In discussing Vietnam, I would like to begin where I left off before this Committee last year. I urged then that we not expand our forces beyond those then committed, which were on the order of 275,000 troops, pointing out that we possessed powerful military enclaves; complexes of sea and air power from which we could conduct operations as necessary to pacify that country.

In the course of the hearing I was asked to state my views to the Committee in writing on bombing and I wrote, in part, the following:

"I believe that we must recognize that the nature of the fighting in Vietnam is quite different than, for example, that of World War II. Basic to the struggle in Vietnam is internal civil strife. Our military efforts, therefore, must be directed toward winning the good will of the people, and retaining that of those who are fighting with us. It follows that bombing attacks intended to achieve psychological impact through the killing of noncombatants is unquestionably wrong. Likewise the attack of targets near areas highly populated by civilians, where civilians are likely to be the casualties, is also militarily as well as morally wrong."

I would like to reaffirm those views today. In my opinion, the bombings of North Vietnam have caused considerable civilian casualties, have not stopped the flow of supplies to the South, and have aroused the ill will of people throughout the world.

Mr. President, I was quoting from pages 3 and 4 of the typewritten transcript of the comments of General Gavin. He reiterated on pages 45, 46, and 47 his objections to the bombing and his reasons for believing it should cease.

On page 50 he said:

One gets uneasy, if you read carefully what has been said about bombing, for example, in the midst of the Lunar truce. We said that they had shipped 35,000 tons of supplies down south, and therefore they violated the truce. Now it seems to me to a thoughtful person this means, "We are giving you a warning now; we are not going to go beyond the pre-truce," and I say this because they could not possibly know what was 35 or 350,000 tons of troop-supplies and this suggests that we stopped all movement

to the theater in the mid-Pacific and every place else of supplies and troops and stopped all movement to the border of our own troops, you see, wherever the confrontation occurred, which of course was not so, and besides in the preceding truce we flew reconnaissance missions that the Vietnamese could not tell from a bomber I am sure or an airplane carrying weapons, so that this announcement in itself was a suggestion to me of more—of there being more behind the statement than the statement itself said.

I do not—I find it difficult to believe all the things that are being said about bombing.

So, Mr. President, we have the testimony of Reischauer, Commager, Kennan, and Gavin that the bombing is counterproductive and that it is a deterrent to efforts to get to the negotiating table.

From a military point of view it is ineffective and, therefore, in my opinion it should be stopped, at least long enough for us to determine whether it is possible to come to the negotiating table if we hold our hand for at least a reasonable period of time.

Mr. President, I wish to read the last paragraph of General Gavin's statement. It appears on pages 16 and 17 of the typewritten transcript. It is the most eloquent statement that any of the witnesses made for the need for a different foreign policy. General Gavin spoke on the conflicts between U.S. capability and foreign commitment. He said at the end:

Now, Mr. Chairman, in summary, I recommend that we bring hostilities in Vietnam to an end as quickly and reasonably as we can, that we devote those vast expenditures of our national resources to dealing with our domestic problems; that we make a massive attack on the problems of education, housing, economic opportunity, lawlessness, and environmental pollution; that we increase the support of all peaceful measures with our neighbors; that this include a thorough evaluation of our aid program; that we seek peaceful relations and closer economic ties with the Eastern bloc of nations. To accomplish this, I believe, for example, that the ratification of the Consular Convention should be accomplished and that the President's program for East-West trade should be encouraged and supported. With an improving society at home and an outgoing approach to dealing with the problems abroad, we shall have no fear whatsoever for our own place in history, for there is a quality of greatness in the American Revolution that is yet to be realized, and, in my opinion, it is a quality that is exportable.

Mr. President, that completes the material which I wish to place in the Record today preliminary to calling up my amendments tomorrow, unless others wish to speak before the amendments are called up.

At that time I expect to speak again, although more briefly, on the assets and liabilities of our policy in Vietnam, what the war is costing us, not only in dollars and lives and the balance of payments, but also the postponement or abandonment of domestic programs, which in my opinion should have a higher priority. I have entitled this speech, "What Price Glory."

What are we paying for the elusive hope of a military victory in Vietnam which might conceivably result in one more "Hurrah"?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 1967:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abene, Charles F.
 Abrams, David P.
 Abrams, Joseph C.
 Ackerson, George T.
 Ackley, Gordon E., Jr.
 Acosta, Louis
 Acosta, Raymond, Jr.
 Adams, Joe E.
 Adams, John W.
 Adams, Norbert H.
 Adams, Richard W.
 Adams, Robert L.
 Adams, William T.
 Adkins, Jimmie L.
 Adler, Sidney S., Jr.
 Aggers, Dean R.
 Aguayo, Ernest M.
 Ahlers, Richard M.
 Ah Sue, Frank L.
 Ainsworth, James J.
 Albert, Bruce M.
 Albright, Thomas E.
 Albright, Walter L.
 Alexander, Richard E.
 Allen, Carl, Jr.
 Allen, James M.
 Allen, James P.
 Allen, Kenneth E.
 Allen, Lloyd, Jr.
 Allen, Raymond K.
 Allen, Thomas V.
 Allum, Phillip D.
 Althoff, Otto T. H., III
 Alvarez, George L.
 Alvarez, Juan C.
 Amberson, William D.
 Ambrose, Ernest G.
 Ambrose, Ronald S.
 Amick, Dewey E.
 Amos, Henry D., Jr.
 Andelin, Marvin R.
 Anderson, Byron A.
 Anderson, Carl W.
 Anderson, Charles F.
 Anderson, Douglas E.
 Anderson, Jack H.
 Anderson, John H.
 Anderson, Joseph C.
 Anderson, Lawrence R.
 Anderson, Melvin L.
 Anderson, "O" "V."
 Anderson, Perry B.
 Anderson, Robert C., Jr.
 Anderson, Terrence E.
 Anderson, Thomas M.
 Anderson, Wilbur L.
 Anderson, William A.
 Annis, James E.
 Anselmo, Salvatore
 Anthony, William J.
 Anti, Raymond L.
 Antle, Gayle
 Appleby, William L.
 Aragon, Gerald P.
 Arango, Gerardo
 Ardolino, Gavin C.
 Arendale, John L.

Barkhouse, Walter E.
 Barkley, Roy T.
 Barksdale, Dennis
 Barnes, Glen E.
 Barnes, James M.
 Barnes, Robert J.
 Barnes, William P.
 Barnett, James W.
 Barnett, Windle W.
 Barnett, Robert K.
 Baronet, Lee N.
 Barrer, Harold B.
 Barriteau, Bradley E.
 Barrow, Bonnie P.
 Barry, James M.
 Barry, Lawrence E.
 Bartell, Harold E.
 Bartlett, Donice R.
 Bartlett, Francis E., Jr.
 Bartlett, James N.
 Bartley, James H.
 Bartley, Charles M.
 Bartolomeo, Clarence C.
 Barton, Charles R.
 Barton, Richard L.
 Baschnagel, Walter T.
 Bash, Robert C.
 Basham, Benjamin E.
 Bass, Charles M.
 Bass, Henry S.
 Bass, Louis M.
 Bassett, James V.
 Bassett, Irving A., Jr.
 Bastyr, Michael J.
 Bates, Joseph F.
 Bates, John L.
 Bates, Ralph S.
 Batha, Frank M., Jr.
 Bau, William P.
 Bauer, John W.
 Baughman, William O.
 Baum, Arthur R., Jr.
 Baumbach, Richard R.
 Baumgardner, Janna R.
 Baurle, Robert E.
 Bausemer, Francis J.
 Baxley, Eugene L.
 Bayse, Daniel L.
 Beadle, Conrad M.
 Beal, Rodney A.
 Bean, Theodore T.
 Beasley, Robert E.
 Beasock, Kenneth U.
 Beatty, Robert E.
 Bechtel, Marvin H.
 Beck, Benjamin W.
 Beck, Bobby L.
 Beck, William O.
 Becker, Edgar L.
 Beebe, Daniel L.
 Beggs, Bernard F.
 Begor, George L.
 Beier, John C.
 Belling, Francis J., Jr.
 Belanger, Durham J.
 Belcher, Travis E.
 Belligotti, Augustus D.
 Belkonen, Thomas C.
 Bell, Charles H.
 Bell, Eugene O.
 Bell, Timothy C.
 Bell, Walter H.
 Bellis, Richard T.
 Belleville, Arthur J., Jr.
 Beman, Charles G.
 Bemish, Richard O.
 Benedict, Fieldon C.
 Benfatti, Raymond C.
 Benjamin, Eugene R.
 Benjamin, Gilbert T.
 Bennett, George J.
 Bennett, Robert W.
 Bennett, Donald E.
 Bennett, Donald R.
 Benoit, Ronald R.
 Benoy, Robert F.
 Benson, Robert C.
 Benson, Thomas G.
 Bentley, Harry L.
 Benton, William C.

Bentson, Roy B.
 Benz, Anthony B.
 Bequette, Bobby F.
 Berdine, Virgil M.
 Beresford, Eugene H.
 Berger, Donald J.
 Berger, Paul A.
 Berger, Roger J.
 Bergerson, John F.
 Berglund, Alfred C.
 Berkey, Kenneth W.
 Berkheiser, Stephen R.
 Berrey, Charles H.
 Berry, Thomas A.
 Berryman, Cecil B.
 Bersano, Bernard L.
 Bershinsky, George V.
 Bertagnoli, William R.
 Berton, Calvin J.
 Bethune, Donald E.
 Beukema, Donald R., III
 Bever, Homer E.
 Beveridge, Albert J., Jr.
 Bevilacqua, Allan C.
 Bewley, Theodore A.
 Bible, Hubert D.
 Bickford, Thomas E.
 Biggers, William A.
 Bigler, David P.
 Bihler, Spencer G.
 Bille, George A.
 Billick, Robert M.
 Billings, Charles E.
 Billipp, Norman K.
 Binder, John A.
 Bingham, Thomas F.
 Bishoff, Franklin R.
 Bishop, Francis A.
 Bishop, John W.
 Bjornas, Forrest R.
 Black, Jerry C.
 Black, William E.
 Blair, Howard M., Jr.
 Blake, James T.
 Blake, Mason G.
 Blanchette, Robert O.
 Bland, Robert W.
 Bland, Thomas M.
 Blank, Joseph J., Jr.
 Blanton, Jerry M.
 Blaylock, Philip W.
 Bledsoe, John D.
 Bledsoe, John W.
 Blessing, LeRoy E.
 Blevins, "L" "D"
 Blocker, Billy R.
 Blott, William
 Blount, Earl C., Jr.
 Blount, John L., Jr.
 Bloxom, Ray L.
 Bly, Oscar E.
 Blyzes, Orville N.
 Boatwright, Dave E.
 Bobb, John T.
 Bobbio, Leonard J.
 Bodkin, Lee D.
 Bodree, Eugene A.
 Bodziak, Henry M.
 Boehm, Robert W.
 Boeker, Arden G.
 Boerner, Robert E.
 Boeyen, William C.
 Bofenkamp, Brent S.
 Boggs, Okey L.
 Boise, Lee A.
 Bokholt, William M.
 Bolen, Glenn E.
 Bolson, James M.
 Bolton, Richard W.
 Bondurant, Richard D.
 Bonifay, Robert L.
 Bonin, Francis G.
 Bonini, Juan B.
 Bonneau, James M.
 Bonsignore, Joseph
 Bontell, William J.
 Booze, Delmar G.

Borek, Max J.
 Borgman, William C.
 Borowick, Albert A.
 Borowy, Alfred J.
 Bos, Richard E.
 Botelho, Ernest
 Bottorff, Norman L.
 Bouldin, John F.
 Boutin, Leo C.
 Bovee, William B.
 Bowen, Clifton E.
 Bowen, Eugene A.
 Bowen, Henry E., Jr.
 Bowers, Earl T., Jr.
 Bowers, Ralph C.
 Bowman, John W., Jr.
 Bowman, Leonard L.
 Bowman, Marlon V.
 Bowyer, Bernard G.
 Bowyer, Lindy E.
 Box, Richard C.
 Boyd, Richard R.
 Boyle, Edward B.
 Boyser, Everett J., Jr.
 Bracken, Wallace D.
 Braden, Norman D.
 Bradford, Ellis J.
 Bradley, Robert G.
 Bradley, Joseph G. A.
 Brady, Donald
 Brady, Earnest W.
 Brady, John A.
 Brage, Jack A.
 Bragg, Kenneth G.
 Braley, Charles A., III
 Brandenburg, William C., III
 Brandenburg, Leo A.
 Brandt, Donald R.
 Brandt, Dale R.
 Brandt, George "H", Jr.
 Branson, Bobbie V.
 Branson, Sylvan K.
 Brassington, Richard C.
 Bray, Sheila R., Jr.
 Brayfield, Nelson E.
 Bream, Philip A.
 Breeze, Eugene
 Brehm, Arthur R.
 Brennan, Edward J.
 Brennan, Joseph J.
 Breshears, "R" "B"
 Brey, Patrick M.
 Bridges, Lionel H.
 Bridges, Robert, Jr.
 Bright, Edward E.
 Bright, Raymond J.
 Bringham, Gary L.
 Brock, George A.
 Broderick, Ernest J., Jr.
 Brodeur, Henry
 Brookman, Donald P.
 Brooks, Garold N.
 Brooks, James W.
 Brooks, Robert D.
 Brooks, Ronald D.
 Brooks, Theo I.
 Broska, Arthur C., Jr.
 Brouillette, George H.
 Broussard, Nelson J.
 Brown, Charles O.
 Brown, Charles W.
 Brown, Constantinos T.
 Brown, Donald A.
 Brown, Donald E.
 Brown, Donald J.
 Brown, Edward H., Jr.
 Brown, Edwin J.
 Brown, Gerald V.
 Brown, George F.
 Brown, Harry A., Jr.
 Brown, Herbert D.
 Brown, James C.
 Brown, James E.
 Brown, Jerrell M.
 Brown, John P.
 Brown, John W.
 Brown, Kermit E.

Brown, Norman
 Brown, Palmer
 Brown, Richard M.
 Brown, Robert A.
 Brown, Robert L.
 Brown, Thomas L.
 Brown, Umphris L.
 Brown, Walter A., Jr.
 Brown, William A.
 Brown, William A.
 Brown, William N.
 Brownfield, Arthur, III
 Brownlee, Joseph L., Jr.
 Bruch, John N.
 Brumagen, Arthur
 Brundage, Warren R., Jr.
 Brunell, Randolph D.
 Bryant, Clarence C.
 Bryant, George M.
 Buck, William L., III
 Buckingham, John E.
 Buckley, Leonard
 Buelow, Frederick A.
 Bugbee, Duane M.
 Buhl, William J.
 Buice, Richard E.
 Bullock, Jeat
 Bumgarner, Olin L.
 Bunn, Marcus L.
 Bunnell, Vernon B.
 Bunting, Jerry E.
 Burch, Verle E.
 Burgess, Bernard E.
 Burgett, Ernest A.
 Burie, James R.
 Burk, Roger R.
 Burke, John R.
 Burkhardt, Robert G.
 Burley, Harold G., Jr.
 Burlingame, William R.
 Burnett, Earl V.
 Burns, Elkanah J., Jr.
 Burns, James M.
 Burns, Kenneth R.
 Burns, Kenneth R.
 Burns, Robert J.
 Burr, Charles A., Jr.
 Burris, Kenneth F.
 Burton, Earl L.
 Burton, Harry E.
 Burton, Ronald R.
 Burtcher, Johnnie D.
 Bury, Leonard M.
 Buschbom, Ronald L.
 Bushey, Charles J.
 Bushnell, Louis G.
 Bussell, Brice L.
 Butchko, Stephen W., Jr.
 Butler, Erston
 Butler, William B., Jr.
 Butts, Bonnie O.
 Byelick, Joseph M.
 Byrnes, Ronald F.
 Bytof, Clarence
 Cady, Raymond J.
 Cahill, William J., Jr.
 Caldwell, Jackie D.
 Caldwell, William
 Call, Fred J.
 Callahan, Howard L.
 Cameron, Charles A.
 Cameron, Donald R.
 Camp, Walter J.
 Campaigne, Markham B.
 Campbell, Charley M.
 Campbell, Donald E.
 Campbell, Donald J.
 Campbell, James E.
 Campbell, Joseph J.
 Campbell, Thomas E.
 Campbell, William J.
 Camper, Donald "A"
 Camper, Ronald "B"
 Candelario, Emilio, Jr.
 Canning, Robert H.

- Cannon, Charles E.
Cannon, James R.
Canonica, Joseph A.
Cantrell, Bryan K.
Cantrell, Harold E., Jr.
Capdepon, Henry P., Jr.
Capecl, Robert L.
Capelle, Paul W.
Capistran, Joseph A.
Cappock, Robert J.
Capps, Darl G.
Caputo, Anthony F.
Cardell, Robert A.
Cardoza, Edward
Carey, Richard L.
Carlisle, Rayon H., Jr.
Carlton, Eugene E.
Carman, James D.
Carmen, Nathaniel W.
Carmody, Edward E.
Carnako, George
Carnicle, Gary L.
Carroll, Robert F.
Carpenter, "H" "C"
Carpenter, James E.
Carpenter, Robert M.
Carr, Thomas L.
Carr, William D., Jr.
Carrington, John H.
Carroll, Patrick G.
Carroll, Robert J.
Carroll, Thomas L.
Carson, Milton E.
Carter, John E.
Carter, Joseph M.
Carter, William L., Jr.
Cartmill, Lloyd J.
Carver, David B.
Carver, Roger E.
Casen, Grover C.
Casey, Andy
Casey, Howard L.
Casey, James J.
Cash, Paul E.
Cash, Robert
Casti, James E.
Castonguay, James J.
Caswell, Charles R.
Catanzaro, Leonard J.
Cates, Ernest H.
Cathcart, James A.
Cato, Dale G.
Caudill, Oscar L.
Caulfield, Thomas J., Jr.
Caussin, John J.
Caylao, Alex H., Jr.
Cedoz, Russell C.
Centers, Norman B.
Chamberlain, Douglas W.
Chamberlain, Richard
Chambers, Cleo M.
Chambers, Justice M., Jr.
Champion, George W.
Chance, Charles L.
Chapman, Arthur J.
Chapman, James F.
Chapman, James L.
Chapman, Laurel E.
Chapman, Walton F.
Charles, Maurice A.
Charrier, James E.
Chase, Jerome M.
Chatelle, Louis A., Jr.
Chavers, Wayland D.
Chaves, Emilio J.
Chaves, Jackson B.
Chavez, Pedro
Chen, Robert L.
Chervenak, Michael P.
Chesnut, Bobby G.
Chickneas, James
Childs, William J.
Chilton, Jack E.
Chin, Earl F. M.
Ching, George M.
Chipman, Edward E.
Chmiel, Larry V.
Choate, Julian R., Jr.
Choate, Larry D.
Choplak, Russell C.
Christ, William E.
Christenson, Howard J.
Christian, Ward E.
Chun, James K. M.
Chupik, Stephen E.
Church, Earl V.
Chytka, Lawrence J.
Cialone, Joseph A., II
Cipolla, Henry J.
Cipperly, William J.
Cipriani, Robert P.
Cirka, Richard G.
Cismar, Frank P., Jr.
Cisneros, Phillip C.
Clancy, William J., Jr.
Clapp, Harold G.
Clapp, Robert D.
Clark, Charles V.
Clark, Donald J.
Clark, Duchesne P., Jr.
Clark, Elmo A.
Clark, Kenneth R.
Clark, Roy L.
Clark, Stephen P.
Clark, Thomas J.
Clarke, Thomas J., Jr.
Clark, Vernon L.
Clausen, Raymond C.
Clem, Kenneth W.
Clemens, Duane T.
Clemmons, Edgar L.
Cleveland, David C.
Cleveland, Harold "K"
Clevenger, Aubrey L.
Clickner, David M.
Clifford, Gerald R.
Clifford, Wilfred J.
Cline, Charles M.
Cline, Charles S.
Clontz, Paul B.
Coble, Rex G.
Cochran, Ralph E.
Cockrell, Ernest
Coconis, Peter P.
Coffey, Allin L.
Cohenour, Keith E.
Colbert, Jarrett, Jr.
Cole, Bobby D.
Cole, Robert E.
Coleman, Harold J.
Coleman, Clinton R.
Coll, William P.
Colleton, Charles F., Jr.
Collier, Donald E.
Collins, Daniel J.
Collins, Joan M.
Collins, Joe R., II
Collins, John L.
Collins, Howard J.
Collura, Joseph
Colly, Joseph P., Jr.
Colney, Earl W.
Colton, William J.
Combs, Edgar G.
Combs, William D.
Comer, Charles G.
Compo, Edward E.
Condroski, Anthony R.
Connell, William R.
Connin, Larry A.
Connly, Robert A., Jr.
Connolly, John L., Jr.
Conover, Jerry L.
Conrardy, William C.
Consolvo, John W., Jr.
Constantine, Stephan L.
Contreras, Solomon O.
Conyers, John M.
Cook, Charles E.
Cook, Dannie L.
Cook, Darrell H.
Cook, Freddy V.
Cook, James A.
Cook, Marvin, Jr.
Cook, Paul M., II
Cook, Rodney
Cooke, Curtis V.
Cooksey, Charles D.
Cooper, Bertrand W., Jr.
Cooper, Charles L.
Cooper, Eldon L.
Cooper, Joseph E., Jr.
Cooper, Warren E.
Copeland, George D.
Copes, William E.
Corcoran, Joseph N.
Corcoran, Kermit C.
Cordes, Alfred G.
Cormier, Gerard A.
Cornelius, Franklin L.
Cornell, Robert A.
Cornett, Hubert C.
Corral, Robert A.
Corsey, Nolan L.
Cortez, Jose F.
Cosby, Donald R.
Cottle, Stanley E.
Coulter, Allen R.
Coulter, Robert J.
Coulter, Ronald K.
Courtney, Robert A.
Cowan, Harry E., Jr.
Cowan, William V., III
Coward, Allen M.
Cox, Billy J.
Cox, Charles K.
Cox, Frank A., Jr.
Cox, Francis L.
Cox, Robert D.
Coyle, Edwin J.
Crabb, Kenneth L.
Craig, Rodger L.
Craiglow, John F.
Cramer, Donald L.
Crandall, Robert J.
Crane, Gordon N.
Craner, Franklin D.
Cravens, Larry G.
Crawford, Duane E.
Craynon, Charles R.
Creamer, Charles E.
Crew, Thomas W., II
Crews, Ellis L.
Cribbs, Winford R.
Crippen, Jack E.
Crist, Larry D.
Critzler, Roger A.
Crockett, Daniel E.
Crockford, Ronald K.
Croghan, Edward J., III
Crone, John
Cronin, Richard A.
Crosby, Robert
Croster, Allen D.
Cross, Charles F.
Crossman, Chester H., Jr.
Crostic, Roy E.
Crouch, Jerry L.
Crowe, John T.
Crowe, William J.
Croy, Louis M., Jr.
Croy, Norvin A., II
Cruikshank, Eugene J.
Cruit, Kenneth A.
Crum, Ralph W.
Culbertson, Louis A.
Culp, Leo "V"
Culp, William L.
Culver, John M.
Cummings, Fledge E., Jr.
Cummings, John D.
Cummins, Philip T.
Curran, John F.
Currey, Arol E.
Curt, William E.
Curtis, Charles E.
Curtis, Harry F.
Curtis, Otis F., IV
Curtis, Terry M.
Cushman, Richard M.
Cusick, Richard D.
Cutshall, James J.
Cutten, Lewyn F., Jr.
Cuyano, Vincent H.
Czapor, Karl W.
Czarnecki, Ronald L.
Czubachowski, Raymond F.
Dailey, Edwin L., Jr.
Daibey, Rolland M.
Daley, James T.
Daley, Raymond C.
Dalton, Robert J.
Dalzell, Richard
Daniel, Alonzo N.
Daniel, William R.
Daniels, Robert L.
Darby, Jackie T.
Darcy, Joseph P.
Dargan, James J.
Darling, Eugene R.
Darnell, James M.
Darnell, William M.
Darner, Trevor E.
Darrow, Ronald B.
Darracott, John F.
Darroch, Robert G.
Darst, Glenn L., Jr.
Daubenspeck, Frederick E.
Daugherty, Gerald B.
Daugherty, James T., Jr.
Davidson, Kenneth M.
Davidson, Larry R.
Davidson, William L.
Davies, Kenneth W.
Davies, Ralph D.
Davis, Albert E.
Davis, Arthur T.
Davis, Carroll C.
Davis, David A.
Davis, Daniel
Davis, Delmont I., Jr.
Davis, Ernest M.
Davis, George K.
Davis, James H.
Davis, James S.
Davis, John W., Jr.
Davis, Muriel
Davis, Raymond A.
Davis, Robert L.
Davis, Samuel D.
Davis, Thomas E.
Davis, Vaughn C.
Dawkins, Edward D.
Dawson, Charles L.
Dawson, Edward L.
Dawson, Samuel L.
Dean, Larry A.
Dean, Paul A.
Deane, Ottilie B.
Deaton, Marvin D.
Deaver, Ralph W.
Decherd, David W.
Decker, William J.
Dederick, Darwin E.
Deffes, Romain J., Jr.
Defrank, James W.
De Grenier, Paul L.
De Gryse, Richard V.
De Hart, Lawrence A.
Deibert, Harold J. E.
Deitrich, James N.
De Jaynes, Hubert D.
Delabarre, Ronald K.
Delacqua, Raymond J.
De La Garza, Luis A.
De Lancey, Joe M.
Delk, Vaughan E.
De Luca, Robert J.
Demers, Russell L.
Denison, Charles F., Jr.
Dennison, Marshall
"C"
De Pietro, James D.
Desjarlais, Roland A.
Desourdy, Robert A.
Devereaux, Jewel L.
Devlinny, Bernard M.
Devitt, John R.
De Wert, William F.
Dewey, Charles H.
Dexter, Harold E.
Diana, Kenneth R.
Dianish, John A.
Dias, Kenneth W.
Di Bernardo, James V.
Dickerson, Charles R.
Dickey, Thomas C.
Diederich, Don E.
Dierker, Henry A.
Dietz, Robert G.
Di Leva, Robert F.
Dill, Henry E.
Dilley, George W.
Dillinger, John W., Jr.
Dillon, James G.
Dillon, Walter R.
Di Maio, Edward
Di Muzio, Camillo A.
Dittman, Richard H.
Ditto, Donald S., Jr.
Divis, James H.
Dixon, Robert D.
Doak, Henry L., Jr.
Dobbs, Jeff A.
Dobson, Peter, Jr.
Dobson, Leroy
Dockery, Billy W.
Dodd, Julian E., Jr.
Dodd, Robert D.
Dodge, Ronald L.
Doherty, John W.
Dohse, Gunther
Dolman, Robert J.
Donlan, James T.
Donley, Paul J.
Donnell, Billy D.
Donovan, James R.
Dooley, Dennis D.
Doorack, Robert J.
Doran, Bernard R.
Doran, Frederick L.
Dorn, Daniel B.
Dornbach, Albert A.
Doss, Thomas L.
Douglas, Daniel C.
Douglas, Kenneth M.
Dow, Arnold H.
Dowden, Frank H.
Dowling, Charles H.
Downey, Jesse
Downie, Robert M.
Downs, David B.
Doyle, Bryant E.
Doyle, Duane R.
Doyle, James A., Jr.
Doyle, John
Doyle, Paul H.
Doyle, Robert D.
Doyle, Teddy J.
Drake, Charles B.
Drew, Charles L.
Drew, Stuart H.
Drivick, John F., III
Drnec, Paul F.
Drucker, Jerome
Drummond, Thomas W.
Duer, Arthur M.
Du Fore, Floyd L.
Du Friend, James M., Jr.
Dugas, Hubert
Duggan, Michael J., Jr.
Duke, William E.
Dunagan, Donald R.
Duncan, Emmett D.
Dundes, George E., Jr.
Dunn, Harvey
Dunn, James A.
Dunn, John F.
Dunn, Ralph W., Jr.
Dupre, Howard J.
Duran, Gregory
Durazo, Carlos C.
Durham, Kenneth G.
Durham, Sidney E.
Dusek, Bobby E.
Dustman, George H., Jr.
Dutiel, Robert O.
Dyberg, Richard H.
Dye, Nellis C.
Dykes, "H" "L"
Dykstra, Lowell G.
Dzialo, Robert E.
Dzik, Arthur J.
Eagle, Monte W., Jr.
Early, Archie L.
Eaton, Jackie L.
Ebert, Robert W.
Eckersen, Frederick
Eckert, Robert L.
Eckley, Rex T.
Eckman, Charles D.
Eckman, George M.
Edelen, Kenneth D.
Edwards, Charles E.
Edwards, Robert I.
Egan, John B.
Eggers, Lee K.
Elcher, Charles D.
Elcess, Weldon L.
Elder, Harold T.
Eldon, Ralph T.
Eley, Richard J.
Ell, Melvin L.
Eller, Henry R.
Eller, Johnnie L.
Ellerbe, Morris C.
Elliott, Vernon R.
Elliott, Thomas M.
Ellis, Billie R.
Ellis, Bruce L.
Ellis, Bruce W.
Ellis, John P.
Ellis, Thurlow D.
Ellis, William F., Jr.
Elmore, Ernest M.
Elms, Robert W.
Eloe, Edwin E.
Emanuel, Calvin D.
Emeney, John B.
Emmett, John P., Jr.
England, Phillip L.
England, Joe H.
English, Fred C.
Ennis, John E.
Ennis, Patrick E.
Enos, Leroy N.
Entwisle, Thomas J.
Ereth, Thomas M.
Erickson, Donald A.
Ericsson, Bruce T.
Eriksson, Dale L.
Ery, John W.
Ervin, Morris L.
Eschenfelder, George J., III
Esler, Richard G.
Esmond, Donald V.
Esmond, Roy D.
Espinoza, Carlos D.
Estela, Manuel
Estep, Vernon C.
Eubank, Leroy E.
Eubank, William E.
Evans, David P.
Evans, Michael J.
Evans, Thomas E.
Evans, William R.
Eveland, William L.
Everett, Zane L.
Fabricius, Gerald D.
Fagen, Clifford L.
Fager, Wendel P.
Fain, Robert L.
Fairbrother, Myrl G., Jr.
Fairchild, Guy R.
Fairchild, Lon C.

Fairley, James A., Jr.
 Falgout, Roy F.
 Falkenstein, Stanley M.
 Fallon, Lewis J., Jr.
 Fanning, John T.
 Farles, Victor H.
 Farlee, Richard E.
 Farr, Roland C.
 Farra, Elwood D.
 Farrington, Richard A.
 Farrow, William T.
 Fasnacht, Jon H.
 Fasulo, John
 Fattig, Charles W.
 Faulkner, Wayne E.
 Favaron, John T.
 Favreau, Robert D.
 Faylor, Dwight G.
 Feaselman, Charles M.
 Featherstone, Joseph F., Jr.
 Fecke, Ralph L.
 Feifs, Helmut A.
 Feiringer, David E.
 Felderman, Keith L.
 Feldhaus, James C.
 Fellingner, Barry E. C.
 Fenn, Ronald S.
 Fenner, Edward G.
 Fenwick, George W.
 Ferguson, Mitchell M.
 Ferguson, Raymond E., Jr.
 Fermino, Francis R.
 Fernandez, Walter J., III
 Ferral, William J.
 Ferrari, Joseph G.
 Ferree, Douglas R.
 Ferree, Harry R.
 Ferris, Richard L.
 Fetchko, John B.
 Fields, James E.
 Fifer, Billy J.
 Fillicko, James W.
 Finlayson, Andrew R.
 Finnie, Richard F.
 Firth, Thomas G.
 Fischer, Harold R.
 Fischer, George A.
 Fischer, Robert C.
 Fischer, John L., Jr.
 Flasette, Robert H.
 Fisher, Joseph V., Jr.
 Fisher, Ronald F.
 Pitts, William A.
 Fitzgerald, Stephen A.
 Fitzgerald, Stuart W.
 Fitzpatrick, Jimmy D.
 Fitzsimmons, Joseph C., Jr.
 Fladd, Robert J.
 Flaherty, Paul S.
 Flanagan, Phillip E.
 Flanagan, John N.
 Flanagan, Wesley E.
 Fleck, Wolfgang H.
 Fleming, James P.
 Fleming, William E.
 Fleming, Ronald D.
 Flery, Joseph J., Jr.
 Fleskes, William G.
 Fletcher, Ernest E.
 Fletcher, Freddie E.
 Fletcher, Fredric L.
 Fletcher, Jack L.
 Fletcher, Morris O.
 Flick, Gerald L.
 Flinn, John D.
 Floe, Jerry D.
 Flom, William F.
 Flood, Henry D.
 Floyd, Henry A., Jr.
 Flynn, Edward H.
 Flynn, George R.
 Fogg, Donald L.
 Foley, Jeremiah R.
 Foley, Nicholas A.

Folsom, Clyde W.
 Fontenot, Robert H.
 Foo, Robert C. K.
 Ford, David L.
 Ford, Norman R.
 Ford, Robert
 Ford, Wayne H., Jr.
 Ford, William G.
 Forester, Donald R.
 Forrest, William E., Jr.
 Fortin, James E.
 Fortson, Marvin P.
 Forvendel, Henry A., Jr.
 Foss, Philip L.
 Foster, Frank C.
 Foster, Robert P.
 Foster, Ronald L.
 Foster, Sterling J., III
 Fountain, Billy V.
 Fox, Charles W.
 Fox, Guy G.
 Fox, Wesley L.
 Fraiser, Martin S.
 Fraker, Adrian X.
 Frakes, Lee W.
 Frame, Robert C.
 Franklin, Thomas L.
 Franks, William D.
 Frantz, Robert L.
 Frazier, Jack E.
 Frazier, Harold W., Jr.
 Freburger, Hamilton P., Jr.
 Frederickson, Robert R.
 Freed, Joseph E.
 Freeman, Mitchell C., Jr.
 Freeman, James H.
 Freeman, Peter E.
 Freeman, Billy R.
 Freeman, Bobby S.
 Freidenberger, George H.
 Freitas, John P.
 French, Alvin E.
 French, John K.
 French, Richard E.
 French, Stanley L.
 Frickle, Frank J., III
 Fritz, Donald H.
 Frost, Donald E.
 Fry, William R.
 Fugera, Franklin J.
 Fulford, Carlton W., Jr.
 Fuller, David D.
 Fulmer, James D.
 Fulton, Daine L.
 Funk, Howard E., Jr.
 Furbee, Richard D.
 Furber, Buddy R.
 Furtney, Arthur J., Jr.
 Futch, Amos W., Jr.
 Fyles, William A.
 Gabriel, Billy K.
 Gabrys, Erich E.
 Gage, Cecil O.
 Gaines, Charles J.
 Gajewski, Francis J.
 Galang, Richard S., Jr.
 Galasky, Michael P.
 Galbreath, Bobby F.
 Gallan, Craig D.
 Gallo, Joseph C.
 Galvin, Eugene A.
 Gamble, Frank R., Jr.
 Gambrell, Jerry C.
 Gangwer, John L.
 Gant, Frederick D., Jr.
 Garavaglia, Joseph E.
 Garber, Charles P.
 Garbrick, James H.
 Garcia, Alfredo S.
 Garcia, Arthur
 Garcia, Clarence D.
 Garcia, Johnny
 Garcia, Louis
 Garcia, Robert H.
 Gardner, Ralph G.

Gardner, Lawrence R.
 Gardner, Kenneth M.
 Gardner, Richard G.
 Garibay, Antonio F.
 Garland, Ronald G.
 Garner, Bertram A., Jr.
 Garner, James "D"
 Garon, John T.
 Garoutte, Robert L.
 Garr, Edward
 Garrett, Carl
 Garrett, Leroy A.
 Garrett, Charles D.
 Garris, Rhyn E.
 Garrow, Robert T.
 Garvey, William F., Jr.
 Gates, Phillip E.
 Gattton, Donald T.
 Gaubert, Raoul J.
 Gay, Logan T., Jr.
 Gaylord, Ivan E.
 Gazaway, Harold S.
 Gearhart, Carl O.
 Geddis, Robert B.
 Gehrdts, Robert P.
 Gehring, Paul, Jr.
 Gelske, John, Jr.
 Gellenbeck, Oscar A.
 Gentemann, James L., Jr.
 George, Leonard E.
 George, Marvin J.
 George, Robert J.
 Gerles, Theodore R.
 Gerlach, Howard L.
 German, Terry G.
 Gessner, Frederick C.
 Getchey, Charles D.
 Ghia, Frank J., Jr.
 Gibbard, Patrick F.
 Gibbs, Gene R.
 Gibbs, Haywood P.
 Gibney, William A.
 Gibson, Ernest L., Jr.
 Gibson, Robert L. J.
 Gibson, Roy
 Gibson, William C., Jr.
 Gibson, William J., Jr.
 Giedzinski, Henry P.
 Gilbert, William E.
 Gidea, Michael J.
 Giles, Earl E.
 Gill, Sam A.
 Gillespie, George E.
 Gillespie, Robert W., II
 Gillis, John P.
 Gilmore, Jimmy G.
 Gilmour, Daniel C.
 Gilstrap, Lester
 Gipson, Carroll S.
 Girardot, Charles E.
 Giroux, George A.
 Giusto, Donald S.
 Glasgow, Robert T.
 Glass, Robert T.
 Glassmire, John R.
 Glausier, Robert E., Jr.
 Glenn, Dearl A.
 Glidden, Marvin S.
 Gloady, Richard C., Jr.
 Glover, John D.
 Goble, Billie J.
 Goble, Woodruff C.
 Godfrey, Robert C.
 Godin, Alfred M.
 Godsil, Richard L.
 Godsil, Stanley W.
 Goedeke, Walter H.
 Goewey, Virgil L.
 Goff, Charles N.
 Goguen, Albert A. J.
 Gogulski, John B.
 Golab, Alfred J.
 Golden, Tom A.
 Golowski, Stanley A.
 Gomeau, Edward J.

Gonsalves, Manuel
 Gonzalez, Gilberto
 Gonzalez, Heriberto
 Gonzalez, Victor B.
 Gooch, Brannon N.
 Good, Loyal W.
 Goodall, Elbert R.
 Goodine, James E.
 Goodman, Monroe A.
 Goodwin, Robert Y.
 Gordon, Robert D.
 Gordon, Samuel M.
 Gordon, William H.
 Gore, William M.
 Gorman, George W.
 Gornic, George J.
 Gosch, Thomas C.
 Gould, Keith R.
 Gould, Ronald W.
 Goulet, Joseph A.
 Gour, Oliver F., Jr.
 Gover, Dan S.
 Govier, Thomas E.
 Goyette, Gerald L.
 Grabenbauer, Wayne E.
 Grabus, Edward J.
 Gracida, Joaquin C.
 Graham, David P.
 Graham, John D.
 Graham, William L.
 Grant, Charles E.
 Grant, Robert A.
 Grassilli, Leo J., Jr.
 Graves, Perry H., III
 Gray, Ainslie A., Jr.
 Gray, Hayward W.
 Gray, Wayne K.
 Green, Billy D.
 Green, James R.
 Green, Jack C.
 Green, Ray H.
 Greenawalt, Harvey E.
 Greenburg, Lawrence K.
 Greene, Russell E.
 Greenfield, John W.
 Greenlaw, Donald B.
 Greenleese, William E.
 Gregory, Eugene W.
 Gregory, Able R.
 Gregory, Donald W.
 Greisen, Bruce R.
 Griesmer, Bruce E.
 Griffin, Samuel E.
 Griffin, Kevin J.
 Griffin, Charles L.
 Griffin, Charles R., Jr.
 Griffin, Joseph A.
 Griffiths, Raleigh R.
 Griffith, Bryan O.
 Griffith, James H.
 Griffith, John A., III
 Grigg, Davis I.
 Griggs, Bobby J.
 Grimes, Jessie
 Grimmer, James R.
 Grinager, Vernon L.
 Grivner, Richard L.
 Grose, Lester R.
 Gross, Francis E.
 Groulx, James W.
 Grove, Ralph M., Jr.
 Grunwald, Richard H. W.
 Guelich, James H., Jr.
 Guerin, James D., Sr.
 Gueterman, Frank J.
 Guffey, David L.
 Gulce, Doyal R.
 Gulle, Frederick A.
 Gully, Robert G.
 Gully, Robert M.
 Gunkel, Alfred N.
 Gustafson, Richard J.
 Gustin, Walter W.
 Guth, Roger A.
 Guthrie, Clarence L., Jr.
 Guy, William D.
 Gwaltney, Robert E.

Gwaltney, William J.
 Gwinn, Robert P.
 Gypin, Fred, Jr.
 Haack, Richard O.
 Haaland, John D.
 Hack, Virgil D.
 Hackett, David S.
 Hagan, Howard P.
 Hagener, Lillian
 Hager, Thomas J.
 Haggerty, Jerald J.
 Haglage, Andrew M.
 Haines, Edward R.
 Haines, Robert L.
 Hajduk, James C.
 Hakim, James J.
 Hale, Edmund D.
 Hale, Jim B., Jr.
 Haliscak, George
 Hall, Ernest L.
 Hall, Jesse B., Jr.
 Hall, Morton L.
 Halloran, Bernard
 Halterman, William R.
 Hamel, Roland L.
 Hamelback, Walter D.
 Hamic, Thomas E.
 Hamilton, Carl D.
 Hamilton, John L.
 Hamilton, Robert E.
 Hamlin, William H.
 Hamm, Troy B.
 Hammond, Glenn R.
 Hampton, Walter R.
 Hancock, John C., Jr.
 Hancock, Troy W.
 Hand, Jesse A.
 Handelsman, Martin H.
 Handley, Clarence I.
 Haney, Robert H.
 Haney, Emmett L.
 Hanger, Darrel W.
 Hankins, Thomas J.
 Hankinson, Robert C.
 Hanle, Arlen J.
 Hann, Thomas E.
 Hansen, Guy R.
 Hansen, James F.
 Hanus, Clois L.
 Hapgood, William R.
 Happy, Robert E.
 Hardie, Richard A.
 Hardin, Bobby L.
 Harding, Alan L.
 Hardman, Eugene R.
 Hardt, Arthur L.
 Hardy, James W.
 Hardy, Ronald E.
 Hargrove, Billy E.
 Harmon, Kenneth D.
 Harmon, Tommy A.
 Harrell, James S.
 Harrell, Charles D., Jr.
 Harrell, Arnold C.
 Harrelle, Roosevelt
 Harrer, William J.
 Harrington, Billy D.
 Harris, Billy M.
 Harris, Don T.
 Harris, James R.
 Harris, Robert E.
 Harris, Robert L.
 Harris, Richard L.
 Harris, Ralph
 Harris, William H.
 Harris, Willie L., Jr.
 Harrison, Leonard J.
 Harrison, Robert D.
 Harrison, Ronald C.
 Harrison, Russell J.
 Harry, Lawrence E., Jr.
 Hart, Berne C.
 Hart, Robert H.
 Hart, Roger M.
 Hartkopf, Albert I.
 Hartman, Donald E.
 Hartnett, Ronald J.
 Hartzler, Earl W.
 Harward, Joseph R., Jr.
 Harwood, Gerald R., Jr.

Hase, Herbert G.
 Haselton, Gerald M.
 Hasse, Ronald E.
 Hassen, Lyle C.
 Hastie, Orville L.
 Hatadis, Robert E.
 Hatch, Emmett L.
 Hatch, William M.
 Hatchel, Joe H.
 Haugen, James H.
 Haught, Harry A.
 Haught, William G.
 Haugley, Lorell J.
 Haukaas, Everette W.
 Hauptfuhrer, Harold B.
 Hauser, Albert W., Jr.
 Hawkes, Lawrence D.
 Hawkins, Robert D.
 Hawkins, Jerrald J.
 Hayes, Jerome D.
 Hayes, William R., Jr.
 Haynes, John L.
 Haynes, Paul C.
 Hayward, Thomas E.
 Hazlett, Donald L.
 Head, Joe M.
 Heavilin, Gale E.
 Heap, Virgil I.
 Heard, Jewel M.
 Heard, Nathan E.
 Heatley, George
 Hebert, Allen J.
 Hebert, Kenneth J.
 Hedgecock, Norman C.
 Hedrick, Charles T.
 Hehner, Walter K., Jr.
 Heidbreder, Henry, Jr.
 Heiden, Charles S.
 Heim, Donald E.
 Heishman, Gordon E.
 Heitz, Bruce A.
 Heitzman, Larry G.
 Helber, Lawrence N.
 Heldreth, Claude E.
 Hellbusch, Ronald A.
 Heller, Frederick P.
 Hellinger, Solomon S.
 Helton, William C.
 Hemlepp, William M.
 Hemming, Michael J. T.
 Henderson, Alfred B.
 Henderson, Charles H.
 Henderson, Delbert D.
 Henderson, Jack R.
 Henderson, James J., III
 Henderson, James M.
 Hendricks, Phillip G.
 Hendrickson, Kenneth J.
 Hendrix, William L.
 Henninger, Edgar W.
 Hennon, Franklin R.
 Henry, Carl J., Jr.
 Henry, Elton O.
 Henry, Herman C.
 Hensel, Frank E.
 Herak, James S.
 Herd, Douglas R.
 Herman, Harley W.
 Hern, Charles R.
 Hernandez, Miguel A.
 Herold, Andrew G., Jr.
 Heroy, Dewey W.
 Hertz, James O.
 Herzog, John M.
 Hesser, Peter M.
 Hester, Robert J.
 Heusner, Robert A.
 Heyse, Rudolph B.
 Hiatt, George A.
 Hiatt, Virgil D.
 Hickerson, Robert
 Hickey, Myles T.
 Hickey, William O.
 Hickman, John L.
 Hicks, Edward Q.
 Hicks, Leroy

- Hiester, Wellington A. Jr.
 Higgs, William W.
 High, Roger D.
 Highhouse, Frederick F.
 Hildebrand, Arthur T., Jr.
 Hill, Albert H.
 Hill, James E.
 Hill, Peter
 Hill, Thomas A.
 Hill, William P.
 Hill, William R., Jr.
 Hillard, Gerald W.
 Hiller, Dale R.
 Hilliard, Albert E.
 Hilliard, Roy L., Jr.
 Hillman, James E.
 Hilton, Richard G.
 Hinds, Munn E., Jr.
 Hines, Howard R.
 Hines, Lonnie R.
 Hinkle, Edmond R.
 Hinman, Rex L.
 Hintz, James D.
 Hirschmann, Harold
 Hisler, Norman R.
 Hix, Clifton L.
 Hobart, Ellis R.
 Hobbs, Comer E.
 Hockensmith, Donald L.
 Hodge, Arthur D.
 Hodge, Joel A., Jr.
 Hodges, Jerry L.
 Hodgins, Edward F., Jr.
 Hodgson, Donald W.
 Hodyor, Richard W.
 Hoedl, Leo J.
 Hoelzle, Jack
 Hoffman, Danny R.
 Hoffman, George J.
 Hoffmann, Ronald G.
 Hofstra, Jack
 Holdeman, Robert E.
 Holderness, John
 Holdridge, Billy B.
 Hollman, Ralph L.
 Hollwiski, Frank D.
 Holk, James N.
 Holland, Kenneth B.
 Hollis, James F.
 Holloway, Clomer J.
 Holmberg, Eugene S.
 Holmes, James D.
 Holmes, Stanley M., Jr.
 Holmgreen, John C., Jr.
 Holschen, Henry J., Jr.
 Holt, Paul L., Jr.
 Holt, Robert A.
 Holt, William A.
 Holter, Vernon P.
 Honbarrier, Harold L., Jr.
 Honza, Billy J.
 Hoogendoorn, Raymond J.
 Hooper, Jerald D.
 Hooper, Theodore D., Jr.
 Hoover, Ronald E.
 Horadan, Lloyd R.
 Horsfall, Walter S.
 Horton, John W.
 Hosek, Louis O., Jr.
 Hoskins, Rowland R.
 Hoskot, Nathaniel R., Jr.
 Hofard, Darrel R., Jr.
 Houck, Harvey D., Jr.
 Hougard, Byron L.
 House, Donald C.
 Housh, Richard H.
 Howard, Donald L.
 Howard, Thomas E.
 Howell, John C.
 Howell, Paul A.
 Hoy, Jack R.
 Hradsky, Robert A.
- Hrebik, Richard K.
 Huddleson, Carl L.
 Hudson, Clarence
 Hudson, Richard A.
 Huels, Walter D.
 Huff, James L.
 Huffman, James W., Jr.
 Hughes, Edward M.
 Hughes, Jacob W., Jr.
 Hughes, Ralph C.
 Hughes, William J.
 Hule, Robert D., Jr.
 Hulcy, Zane C.
 Hull, Denford J.
 Hulsey, James G., Jr.
 Humm, Edmond R.
 Humphrey, Doyle E.
 Hundley, Thomas Y.
 Hunt, William R., Jr.
 Hurst, Charles E.
 Hurt, Roosevelt
 Huskey, Donald R.
 Huslander, Richard E.
 Husted, Thomas H., Jr.
 Huston, Wayne B.
 Hutchinson, Arnold A.
 Hutchinson, Homer G., III
 Huth, Gary T.
 Hutsler, William C.
 Hutson, Larry W.
 Hutton, John W.
 Hyde, John S.
 Hyland, Edward C.
 Illes, Steve J.
 Imes, Donald E.
 Imhauser, Robert W.
 Ingersoll, Alvah E., Jr.
 Ingraham, Charles H., Jr.
 Ingram, Walter E.
 Innerarity, Vernon E.
 Irons, John L.
 Irvine, Floyd D.
 Irvine, Joseph W.
 Irvine, Thomas R.
 Israel, Larry N.
 Iversen, Rolf R.
 Jabs, Walter L.
 Jackson, Marvin L.
 Jackson, Kaye E.
 Jackson, Dennis D. W.
 Jackson, Jerald W.
 Jackson, Richard B.
 Jackson, Buddy K.
 Jacobs, Charles E., Jr.
 Jacobs, George T.
 Jacobsen, Arthur R., Jr.
 Jacobsen, Randall N.
 Jacobson, Theodore R.
 Jacome, Robert A.
 James, Danny D.
 Jameson, Christopher P.
 Janis, Joseph J.
 Janke, Jimmie E.
 Jarrell, Roland
 Jarvin, Donald C.
 Jasmuno, Robert F.
 Jealous, Bradford
 Jeffery, Harry D.
 Jeffries, John M.
 Jenkins, Ralph H.
 Jenkins, Walter R.
 Jenkins, Clifton S., Jr.
 Jennings, Earl M.
 Jennings, James
 Jeremiah, John B.
 Jernee, Huston R.
 Jesse, Franklin E.
 Jewell, Jack D.
 Jiminez, Francis
 Johann, Joseph A.
 Johanson, David D.
 John, Noel A.
 Johnson, Albert E.
 Johnson, Arney M., Jr.
 Johnson, Carl O.
 Johnson, Carl R.
- Johnson, Dale L.
 Johnson, Dan C.
 Johnson, Dan E.
 Johnson, David F.
 Johnson, Dennis W.
 Johnson, Donald D.
 Johnson, Donald R.
 Johnson, Elsie M.
 Johnson, George O.
 Johnson, Harold B.
 Johnson, Kenneth E.
 Johnson, Laverne E.
 Johnson, Paul C.
 Johnson, Richard, Jr.
 Johnson, Richard S., Jr.
 Johnson, Richard W.
 Johnson, Robert J.
 Johnson, Stanley P.
 Johnson, Vernon J.
 Johnson, Weldon W.
 Johnson, Wesley D.
 Johnson, William D.
 Johnson, William F.
 Johnston, Bobby M.
 Johnston, Darrell G.
 Joiner, James E.
 Joles, Kenneth D.
 Jolly, Charles M.
 Jolly, Charles S., Jr.
 Jones, Allen L.
 Jones, Bruce R.
 Jones, Charles T.
 Jones, Clarence H.
 Jones, Daniel T., Jr.
 Jones, Earnest J.
 Jones, Edward T., Jr.
 Jones, Floyd S.
 Jones, Harold L., Jr.
 Jones, Henderson B.
 Jones, James D.
 Jones, James W.
 Jones, John L.
 Jones, Kenneth W.
 Jones, Morris, Jr.
 Jones, Paul D., Jr.
 Jones, Philmon E.
 Jones, Reginald L.
 Jones, Richard D.
 Jones, Richard W.
 Jones, Robert J.
 Jones, Thomas H.
 Jones, Walter K.
 Jones, William A.
 Jones, William T.
 Jordan, Joe T.
 Jordan, William F.
 Journey, John E.
 Joyce, Robert E.
 Jozwiakowski, Richard P.
 Juarez, Luis A.
 Julich, Paul, Jr.
 Justice, William N., Jr.
 Kaczinski, Marcellus J.
 Kadlecik, John, Jr.
 Kahl, Herbert S.
 Kahl, Martin F.
 Kahl, Thomas A.
 Kammeier, Cyril L.
 Kane, Gerald T.
 Kane, William J., Jr.
 Kanocz, Michael, Jr.
 Kappel, Jacob, Jr.
 Karasek, Robert G.
 Karch, Lawrence G.
 Karr, James T.
 Karrer, Joseph J.
 Kasson, George P.
 Kasten, William
 Katz, Robert E.
 Kaus, Eugene J.
 Kavanaugh, John W., III
 Kearley, Arthur M.
 Kearney, Thomas F.
 Keatley, Roger L.
 Kee, Gary S.
 Keeler, Clyde E., Jr.
- Keeler, Doris M.
 Keene, David R.
 Keglovits, Edward J.
 Keim, John R.
 Keker, John W.
 Keller, Harry L.
 Keller, Richard S.
 Keller, William E., Jr.
 Kelley, Jessie W.
 Kellison, Charles R.
 Kelly, George W.
 Kelly, James R.
 Kelly, John M.
 Kelly, Michael S.
 Kelly, Ralph E.
 Kelly, Richard M.
 Kelly, Samuel C., III
 Kelly, Thomas P.
 Kelly, William D.
 Kelly, William E.
 Kemerley, Richard K.
 Kemick, Gerald T.
 Kemmis, Edward D.
 Kemper, George R., Jr.
 Kemple, William G.
 Kendall, James E.
 Kendall, Ronald R.
 Kendig, Dennis R.
 Kendrick, Edgar T.
 Kennedy, Laurance J.
 Kennedy, Delbert E.
 Kennedy, William G.
 Kenner, George F.
 Kenner, William W., Jr.
 Kenniston, George P.
 Kent, Arthur L., Jr.
 Kent, James M.
 Kentner, Raymond L.
 Kepford, Carl B.
 Kerchner, Henry A.
 Kerr, Howard E.
 Kerr, Richard A.
 Kerr, Samuel L.
 Kersey, Ronald R.
 Kettler, Jack
 Keytes, Roy C.
 Kicklighter, Rodney C.
 Kiehl, Richard M.
 Kiemel, Raymond E.
 Kight, James
 Kiker, Meek C., Jr.
 Killian, Bobby P.
 Kim, Joseph W., III
 Kimball, Thomas R.
 Kimball, Lynn J.
 Kimble, Ralph R.
 Kindler, Gary L.
 King, Ben W.
 King, Claude E.
 King, Claude E.
 King, James F.
 King, John C.
 King, Thomas G.
 King, Wayne W.
 Kinnear, John H.
 Kinslow, George C.
 Kipick, Mike
 Kirchessner, Gerald P.
 Kirchmeier, Robert T.
 Kirin, Michael J.
 Kirk, Harvey O.
 Kirk, Paul C.
 Kirk, Robert W.
 Kirkland, Golden C.
 Kirkman, Timothy R.
 Kirkpatrick, William S.
 Kirkpatrick, Loren K.
 Klansky, Gerald J.
 Klesyk, Francis, Jr.
 Kline, Roy C.
 Kling, Harry A.
 Klingensmith, Harold A.
 Klingensmith, Harry G.
 Kloczek, Joseph J.
 Kloch, Robert L.
 Klunk, Harold P.
- Knack, John M.
 Knapp, John R.
 Knight, William A.
 Knipper, William J.
 Kniska, Nicholas E.
 Knocke, James J.
 Knowles, Coleman R., Jr.
 Knowles, Robert E.
 Knox, Richard D.
 Kobel, Alan D.
 Kobel, William L.
 Koble, Ned A.
 Koelln, Kenneth A.
 Kohler, William C.
 Kolha, Joe J.
 Kollar, Joseph J.
 Komo, Raymond S.
 Kondo, Herbert S.
 Kopacz, John R.
 Kraft, Leo W.
 Krajewski, Joseph S.
 Kramer, William L.
 Kramp, Kay E.
 Krantz, Everett W.
 Krauer, John J.
 Kreiling, William
 Kresty, Edward J.
 Krieger, Edward T., Jr.
 Kroelinger, William L.
 Krohn, Orville E.
 Kromis, Emanuel J.
 Krone, Melvin P.
 Krueger, Ronald L.
 Kucinski, Julius W.
 Kuhlman, Robert J., Jr.
 Kuhlman, Norman K.
 Kuhn, Coleman D., Jr.
 Kuykendall, Billy H.
 Kuzmenko, Tom A.
 Labby, Charles E., Jr.
 Laboissiere, David J.
 La Bounty, Norman F.
 Lacey, Don C.
 Lacoursiere, Robert P.
 Lacy, Horace W.
 Lacy, John J.
 Ladd, Lawrence "K"
 Ladner, Claude J.
 Laing, Ivan A.
 Lake, Donald E.
 Lake, Donald L.
 Lake, James E.
 Lamb, Michael R.
 Lambert, Leon
 Lambert, Frank A.
 Lambert, Glynn P.
 Lamberth, Scott M.
 Lamblasi, Louis C.
 Lambka, Harvey L.
 Lamczyk, Everett E.
 La Montagne, Henry J.
 La Montagne, Robert N.
 La Motte, Francis W., Jr.
 Lamson, John C.
 Landrum, Dale F.
 Lane, Benny W.
 Lane, Billy B.
 Lane, Bobby
 Lane, James V.
 Lane, John S.
 Lane, Warren R.
 Lang, Bruce A.
 Lang, Elbridge W.
 Lange, Robert K.
 Langin, Charles E.
 Langley, Robert C.
 Lantis, Howard G.
 Lanthier, Richard G.
 Larkin, Edward J.
 Larkin, Joseph V.
 Larson, Duane D.
 Larson, Richard M.
 Larsson, Thomas R.
 La Rue, Billy B.
 Lasher, Jerry V.
 Lastovica, Jerry L.
- Latham, Irving C.
 Latham, Julian S.
 Laton, Roger L.
 Laughlin, Ronald J.
 Laughner, Donald E.
 Lauland, Thomas H., Jr.
 Lauretta, Antonio
 Laverty, Chester N.
 Laverty, Robert C.
 Lawler, Eugene D.
 Lawrence, Charles A. L.
 Lawrence, Edmond H.
 Lawrence, Thomas J.
 Layton, Lewis W., Jr.
 Lea, Franklin S.
 Leach, Harold W.
 Leach, William H.
 Leahy, John J.
 Leal, Jimmie V.
 Leathers, James P.
 Le Doux, Roger "O"
 Lee, Earl C.
 Lee, John A.
 Lee, John J.
 Lee, Lendith
 Lee, Richard R.
 Lee, William E.
 Leedle, James M.
 Legere, Alfred H.
 Legg, William E.
 Lemmond, Walter V., III
 Lemoine, Stanley P.
 Lenhart, George E.
 Lenhart, Richard A.
 Lenn, Donald S.
 Leonski, Joseph A.
 Le Page, Lawrence J.
 Lepore, William P., Jr.
 Lesh, Thomas "J"
 Levensgood, Joseph C.
 Lewallen, James W.
 Lewandowski, Eugene S.
 Lewis, Kenneth D.
 Lewis, Robert C.
 Lewis, Samuel P.
 Lewis, Willard R.
 Lichty, Randall W.
 Liddback, George S., Jr.
 Liebert, Karl F.
 Light, Bobby R.
 Lilja, Ralph B.
 Lilley, John M.
 Lilly, Junior
 Lind, Paul A.
 Lindholm, Hans W.
 Lindsay, Samuel E., Jr.
 Lindsey, Joel F.
 Lindsey, Steven P.
 Lisenbe, Bobby M.
 Lisenby, William E.
 Listwan, Albert J.
 Little, Allan G.
 Little, Herman I., Jr.
 Little, John R.
 Little, Roy F.
 Littlefield, Arthur I., Jr.
 Littler, James L. M., III
 Littrell, Roy L.
 Llewellyn, William D.
 Lloyd, Burdell L., Jr.
 Lloyd, Robert A.
 Lockwood, Charles E.
 Lockyer, Arron K.
 Loeffler, Charles H.
 Loeffler, Robert L.
 Loehr, Curtis J.
 Lofton, William A.
 Loftus, Edward P.
 Logan, Bernard W.
 Logar, Michael F.
 Lohr, John L.
 Lonetti, Richard P.
 Long, Boyzy C.
 Long, Carl E.

- Long, Charles E.
Long, Charles J.
Long, Lowell D.
Loof, Charles J., Jr.
Lord, Robert L.
Lorelli, Jerry N.
Lorensen, Frederick A.
Losey, Charles E.
Loughren, Frederick R.
Loustanaunau, Charles, Jr.
Love, Ronald L.
Lovelace, Richard J.
Lovell, John T.
Lovitt, Willis J., Jr.
Lowe, John W.
Lowe, William N.
Lowell, Joel K.
Lowery, John S., Jr.
Loy, David W.
Lubbe, Walter W., Jr.
Lucas, David J., Jr.
Lucas, Harry A.
Lucas, Troy A.
Lucenius, Arne B.
Lucero, David A.
Lucht, Dean C.
Lucy, Jimmie L.
Luedtke, Dale C.
Luissa, Edward M., Jr.
Lukawecz, Theodore
Luke, David A.
Lum, Allen J. A.
Lumpkins, Sellards L.
Lund, Robert E.
Lundberg, Helmer G., Jr.
Lunn, Carl K.
Lunt, George L., Jr.
Lusignan, John H.
Lutz, Fred, Jr.
Lutz, Kenneth O.
Luxemburger, Maxwell C.
Lykens, William F., Jr.
Lynch, John F.
Lynch, Peter
Lynch, Robert L.
Lytle, John T.
Mac Cormack, Dana F.
Mac Donald, Hazen E.
Mac Farlane, Larry S.
Mac Farlane, Robert W.
Mac Geary, Fred E.
Machado, Enrique L.
Machovec, Richard A.
Mac Iver, Colin R.
Mac Kenzie, Robert B.
Mackey, David G.
Mackins, Jeff G.
Macklin, Herman E.
Mackly, Gerald
Mac Pherson, Ray D.
Macy, Ronald T.
Madsen, Alfred L.
Magers, Donald P.
Maguire, Paul B.
Malden, John E.
Main, Stanley W.
Majewski, Norbert L.
Mallard, Ira T.
Mallette, Gerald O.
Mallon, Thomas W.
Malnicof, Harry B.
Malone, Loren J.
Maloney, John C.
Maloney, John M.
Maloney, John T.
Maloy, Thomas D., Jr.
Manbeck, Lewis D.
Manifold, Dale W.
Manion, Jimmy L.
Manley, James D.
Mann, Daniel I.
Mann, Marion R.
Mann, Thomas J.
Manning, Earl J.
Manning, John A.
Manning, Joseph R.
Manry, Tommy E.
Mansdorf, Bruce D.
Manz, Joseph C.
Marchette, Donald C.
Marcum, George L.
Marek, Gaylord J.
Mariz, Robert J.
Markowski, Frank G.
Marland, Daniel, Jr.
Marlow, Donald R.
Marnon, John J.
Marois, Armand
Marrone, Samuel R.
Marshall, Alvin F., Jr.
Marshall, John J.
Marshall, Russell H.
Martello, Herbert P., Jr.
Martin, Bobby O.
Martin, Donald J.
Martin, David O.
Martin, Francis L.
Martin, James J.
Martin, Joseph L.
Martin, Joseph M., Jr.
Martin, Louis G.
Martin, Nelson R.
Martin, Paul S.
Martin, Ronald A.
Martinez, Carlos
Maruhn, Richard L.
Marvin, Horace W.
Marzoli, Joseph
Mashburn, Lester E.
Maslyk, Edward G.
Mason, Michael R.
Mason, Wayne B.
Masone, Vincent J.
Massey, Allen W.
Mastroberti, Michael P.
Matchett, John W.
Mathis, Don E.
Mathys, Dale A.
Matkowski, Joseph R.
Matras, Lawrence W.
Matte, Joseph C.
Matte, Leland J.
Matteson, Richard J.
Matthews, Gordon B.
Matthews, John T., Jr.
Matthews, Millard F., Jr.
Matthews, Peter J.
Matthews, Robert J.
Mattox, Leon
Matzko, Dean H.
Mauricio, Roberto P.
Maxon, Don K.
Maxwell, Daniel M.
Maxwell, John
Maxwell, Donald M.
May, Kenneth N.
Mayer, Robert, Jr.
Mayes, Ronald J.
Mayfield, Sanford F.
Maynard, Kenneth L.
Maynard, Fredrick
Maynes, Robert L.
Mayo, Harold D., Jr.
Mayo, Philip S.
Mayo, William H., Jr.
Mazzel, Edmund J.
McAfee, Marvin K.
McAlister, John T.
McAuley, William T., II
McAvoy, Paul O., Jr.
McBride, William G., Jr.
McCabe, James J.
McCain, Daniel N.
McCall, William D., Jr.
McCallon, Frank E.
McCallum, John E. B.
McCarter, William D.
McCarthy, Frank H.
McCarthy, John E., Jr.
McCarthy, Richard C.
McCartney, Joseph R.
McCauley, Benjamin D.
McClain, "R" "L"
McClellan, Ramon V.
McClure, Raymond B.
McCombs, Francis
McConnell, Richard S.
McCord, Richard G.
McCormack, James S.
McCormick, Donald W.
McCourt, Edward F., Jr.
McCourt, Thomas
McCrane, Cleo H.
McCue, John W., III
McCulloch, Billy R.
McDaniel, Joe E.
McDevitt, Richard L.
McDonald Denis H.
McElroy, Joseph A.
McElvain, Ronald R.
McEwen, Robert G.
McFadden, Bernard W.
McFarlane, Andrew B.
McGann, Joseph
McGee, Henry W.
McGinniss, Milburn
McGrath, Alvin L.
McGraw, John J.
McGraw, Reginald K.
McGuire, John P.
McInay, Bernard L.
McInerney, James P.
McInnes, John M.
McIntosh, Roger A.
McIntyre, Max
McIver, Wallace L.
McKay, Frederick R.
McKay, John E.
McKee, Dennis T.
McKee, Larry E.
McKenna, Joseph C.
McKinney, Harry T., Jr.
McKinnon, Joseph R.
McKnight, Matthew O.
McKnight, Thomas A.
McLaughlin, John E.
McLaughlin, Robert J.
McLaughlin, William J.
McLean, Albenious P.
McLemore, Kenneth N.
McMakin, John F., Jr.
McManus, Raymond J.
McMenamin, Harry D.
McMenany, Edward L., Jr.
McMillan, Milburn H.
McMullin, Jack H.
McMullin, Thomas B.
McNamara, William
McNulty, Jerry W.
McPartland, Paul D.
McPeak, Melvin E.
McPherson, Warren R.
McQueary, Daniel H.
McSpadden, Bert L.
McVey, Lavoy D.
McWaters, Fred H.
McWhorter, Robert J.
Means, Charles E.
Means, John R.
Medearis, Eldon G., Jr.
Medina, Joseph M., Jr.
Mednis, Alfons J.
Meece, Ralph D.
Meech, Robert A.
Meech, Wayne A.
Meegan, George B.
Meehleder, James M.
Meek, Phillip E.
Meeker, Charles C.
Meeks, Joseph R.
Meier, Fred J., Jr.
Meisner, Donald E.
Mello, Edmund M.
Mellon, Bruce
Mendoza, Raymond A.
Mentzer, John H., II
Mercer, Edward F.
Merlino, John A.
Merna, Gerald F.
Merrell, Robert G.
Merritt, Jimmy M.
Messler, Alfred L.
Messinger, Gene V.
Metcalfe, Edwin A.
Meyer, Edward H., Jr.
Meyer, William O., Jr.
Meyers, Bradford B.
Meyers, Donald J.
Meyers, Gary G.
Meyers, John L.
Meyers, Richard B.
Michael, Edward L.
Migliacci, Joseph A.
Mikulsky, John J.
Milavic, Anthony F.
Milburn, Carroll R.
Miles, John J.
Miles, William R.
Millard, James C.
Millard, Arthur F.
Miller, Andrew P.
Miller, Ashby R.
Miller, Burleigh W.
Miller, Charles R.
Miller, Don P., Jr.
Miller, Jacques L.
Miller, James E.
Miller, Jerry J.
Miller, Lester V.
Miller, Miles T.
Miller, Norman A.
Miller, Phillip M.
Miller, Robert L.
Miller, Robert S.
Miller, Richard E.
Miller, Ralph H.
Miller, Raymond R., Jr.
Miller, Thomas C.
Miller, Thomas J.
Miller, William A.
Miller, William R.
Miller, Walter N.
Millichap, Peter B.
Milliman, Glenn P.
Milliron, Robert E.
Mills, Dorne A.
Mills, Donald E.
Mills, Jimmie L.
Mills, Thomas C.
Milne, James E.
Milton, Ralph A.
Mino, Michael J.
Mitchell, Earl W.
Mitchell, Floyd G.
Mitchell, Mack E.
Mitchells, William L.
Mix, Tom A.
Moble, Perry A.
Moe, Harold J.
Moffitt, Kermit
Mollendor, James J. C.
Moller, Harry R.
Moneypenny, Guy E.
Montana, Douglas W.
Montgomery, Orrie G.
Moody, Johnney W.
Moog, David C.
Mook, David
Mooney, John F.
Moore, Bill Z.
Moore, Bruce K.
Moore, Edward L., II
Moore, Fred A., Jr.
Moore, Frank O., Jr.
Moore, Henry
Moore, Kenneth W.
Moore, Theodore C.
Moore, Theodore M.
Moore, William A.
Moore, William J.
Moore, William T., Jr.
Moorhead, Robert D.
Moos, Walter H. I.
Mora, Aurelio
Moran, Richard C.
Moran, Richard G.
Morgan, Francis T., Jr.
Morgan, Franklin M.
Morgan, Grover K.
Morgan, Robert Y.
Morgan, Roger G.
Morgan, William A.
Morilla, Robert G.
Morin, Richard G.
Moring, Joe D.
Morocco, Pasquale J.
Morrill, Alan L.
Morris, Charles A.
Morris, Herbert R., Jr.
Morris, John R.
Morris, Kenneth A.
Morris, Richard L.
Morris, Stanley S., Jr.
Morrison, Allen W.
Morrison, Arthur E., Jr.
Morrison, Jerald J.
Morrison, John R.
Morrisey, John T., Jr.
Morrow, Charles L.
Morrow, Edward
Morrow, Joseph M.
Mort, James H.
Morton, Merrill T.
Morts, Harold D.
Mosley, Don E.
Moss, Lawrence W.
Mossey, Donald J.
Mossier, Alfred H.
Mott, Dean V.
Mottard, Dean L.
Moulton, Bruce L.
Moungells, Stavros S.
Mounter, Paul H.
Moxley, William H.
Moyer, Samuel L.
Mucci, Anthony
Mueller, Richard A.
Mulford, Randolph M.
Mull, Robert L.
Mullaney, Garrell S.
Muller, Richard J.
Mullins, Peter F.
Mulvey, William R.
Mumford, John V.
Munday, Ted L.
Mundy, Marion E.
Munn, Warren E.
Murphy, David B.
Murphy, James P.
Murphy, Michael W.
Murphy, Timothy J.
Murray, Gilbert W.
Murray, Grover
Murray, John E.
Murray, Peter J.
Murry, Joseph A.
Musser, Richard E.
Myers, Clair D.
Myers, Earl G., Jr.
Myers, Edward M.
Myers, Glenn N.
Myers, Hugh G., Jr.
Myers, Larrle J.
Myers, Lonnie M.
Myers, Paul A., Jr.
Myers, Richard D.
Nadeau, Arthur G.
Nagal, Hideo
Nagelin, Thomas F., Sr.
Nail, Gary L.
Nailor, Richard A.
Napieralski, Gerald R.
Nash, Gail L.
Nason, Gilbert L.
Natt, Frank, Jr.
Nazarchuk, Daniel A.
Neely, Gerard T.
Neff, Thompson D.
Nelson, Albert C.
Nelson, Delbert L.
Nelson, Edward A.
Nelson, George, Jr.
Nelson, Monte V.
Nelson, William H., Jr.
Nemeth, John W.
Netherly, Cecil
Nettleingham, Allen D.
Neubauer, Ronald S.
Neveu, Alfred C.
New, Walter
Newell, Charles A.
Newkirk, Gary L.
Newman, Ronald D.
Newton, Richard B.
Neyt, Ronald J.
Nicholas, Billy D.
Nichols, James D.
Nichols, Robert J.
Nickell, Scott G.
Nicklin, Richard F.
Nicolai, Peter W.
Nicolopoulos, John S.
Nicosia, Donald D.
Nida, Carl E.
Nienstedt, James F.
Nigro, Anthony
Nimmow, Donald D.
Nix, Joseph R.
Nixon, Joe A.
Nixon, William F.
Nobriga, Leabert F.
Noel, John F., Jr.
Noonan, William, Jr.
Noonkester, Henry E.
Norman Geoffrey W.
Norton, Frank J.
Norton, Phillip C.
Norton, Patrick T.
Norton, Robert L.
Norton, William D.
Norwood, Thomas H.
Norwood, Richard H.
Nothhaft, Henry R.
Novak, John P.
Nowicki, Norbert J.
Nozar, John J.
Nyenbrink, Henry W.
Oakley, Howard C.
Oatis, Peter W.
O'Brien, Thomas M.
O'Chippinti, Charles W.
Ockly, Eugene J.
O'Connor, Patrick R.
O'Connor, George R.
O'Connor, Charles F.
Odegard, Ralph P.
O'Dell, Frank E.
Oehlers, Roy M.
Oetting, Robert H.
Offutt, Charles W.
O'Hara, William J.
O'Leary, Patrick J.
Olmstead, Howard W.
Olsen, Almart H.
Olsen, James G.
Olsen, John O.
Olson, Leland M.
Olson, Roy C.
Olson, Robert D.
Olson, Thomas A.
Ondrak, Daryle M.
O'Neil, Donn L.
O'Neill, Peter J.
O'Neill, Stephen J.
Oppenhuizen, John P.
Ordway, Ruel E.
Orlando, Louis D.
Orona, Louis, Jr.
O'Rourke, James M., Jr.
Orr, James C.
Osborne, Hansel E.
Osenkoski, Stanley M.
Osgood, Carl G., Jr.
O'Shields, Robert C.
O'Shields, Tommy S.
Osterberg, Richard R.
O'Sullivan, Thomas T.
Oswald, Donald H.
Ota, Yoneo
O'Toole, Thomas F., Jr.

- Oubre, Melvin J.
Outrakis, Nicholas J.
Owen, Albert A.
Owen, James R.
Owen, Joseph C., Jr.
Owens, Billy W.
Owens, Charlie C.
Owsley, Gerald E.
Owsley, Robert E.
Oxford, Lynn D.
Pachucki, Robert J.
Page, Herbert M., Jr.
Pahl, Gerald S.
Palge, Joseph J.
Painter, Billy G.
Pallang, Rodney L.
Pallo, Mathew, Jr.
Palmer, Doll C.
Palmer, Leonard E., Jr.
Pancoast, Harry L., Jr.
Panicall, Louis V.
Panknin, James D.
Papciak, George J.
Paquette, Paul
Parker, Allen D.
Parker, Charles D.
Parker, George R., Jr.
Parker, Hubert L.
Parker, Joseph A., Jr.
Parretti, Lawrence
Parrish, Bobby J.
Parrish, Julian W.
Parrott, Howard G.
Parry, Fred R.
Partain, Warren B., Jr.
Parton, Donald J.
Partridge, Gerald B.
Paschen, Charles W.
Pascual, Ronald J.
Paskovich, Theodore
Patridge, James O.
Pattat, Albert W.
Patterson, Hobart D., Jr.
Patton, Doyle M.
Patton, Robert F.
Pauk, James S.
Paurazas, Edward J.
Pavlik, Alfred J.
Paxton, Jack T.
Payne, Courtney B.
Payne, Walter A.
Pearce, Arthur R.
Pearce, Bruce W.
Pearce, Patrick A.
Pearson, Charles R.
Pease, Delbert A.
Peck, Joseph E.
Pedersen, Charles L.
Pedlar, Dean C.
Peeples, Walter A.
Pelczarski, Paul R.
Pelletier, Conrad R.
Pelletier, George A.
Pelletier, Perly A.
Pell, James A., Jr.
Pelt, William M.
Peltzer, Benson, Jr.
Pendarvis, Robert H.
Pendergast, Paul
Pendleton, Martin H.
Penman, Donald E.
Penman, David T.
Pennington, Earl
Pentony, Thomas J.
Pepe, Francis A.
Peregoy, Edmund T.
Perkins, William N.
Perkins, Huette D.
Perrin, Jack N.
Perry, Jimmy R.
Perry, Joseph
Perry, Richard P.
Perry, Ronald L.
Pete, Guy A., Jr.
Peters, Maxwell R.
Peters, Sterling R.
Peters, William C.
Peterson, Clarence F.
Peterson, Dennis A.
Peterson, George L., Jr.
Peterson, Gordon F.
Peterson, John E.
Peterson, John W.
Peterson, Robert A.
Petrone, John A.
Petry, Rudge
Pettit, Kenneth E.
Petty, Robert H.
Petzel, Ronald J.
Peyer, Otto W., Jr.
Phelan, James M.
Phelps, Douglas E.
Phillippi, Lewis M., Jr.
Phillips, Bruce M.
Phillips, Charles L.
Phillips, Clarence W., Jr.
Phillips, Donald F.
Phillips, Ennis T., Jr.
Phillips, Kent W.
Phillips, Weller A., III
Piconke, Ronald J.
Pier, Robert P.
Pieratt, John J.
Pierce, Arthur A.
Pierce, John F.
Pierse, Donald E.
Pihl, Donald E.
Pike, John E.
Pike, Ralph H.
Pinguet, Jean
Pinnell, Murry C.
Pinola, Tony R.
Piontek, Edward
Pippin, James R.
Pitcher, Kenneth E.
Pitts, Edward F.
Pitts, James E.
Pitts, Michael G.
Pitts, Robert D.
Plank, Adolph L., Jr.
Plant, Bernard M.
Plante, Leo G.
Platt, Charles L.
Plots, Robert F.
Polasek, Edward J., Jr.
Pollmiller, Lawrence A.
Pollock, William W.
Ponder, Carl N.
Pontillas, Robert G.
Pool, Glaston
Pope, Joe A.
Pope, John R.
Pope, Paul E., Jr.
Pope, Robert E.
Porter, Bebe B.
Porter, Richard L.
Post, Raymond, Jr.
Postalwalt, Ronzel E.
Posthuma, Henry
Pothier, Gerald T.
Potter, Donald D.
Poulin, Edward G.
Powell, Clayton A.
Powell, Frank D.
Powell, William B., Jr.
Powell, William H.
Prato, Sam J.
Pratt, Donald L.
Prelgovsk, John A.
Pendergast, Thomas J.
Preston, Ralph A., Jr.
Pretsch, Donald C.
Price, Dwight L.
Price, Fred R.
Price, Jimmie
Price, Robert F.
Price, Thomas L.
Price, William S., Jr.
Priddy, Sanford J.
Prokopchuk, Nicholas
Pruett, Bobby R.
Puricelli, Russell A.
Purnell, George W.
Purvis, Charles F.
Quan, Raymond J.
Quest, Herman W.
Quigley, William J.
Quigley, Alvin J.
Quill, Lewis R.
Quinn, James E.
Quinn, John E.
Raber, William E.
Rabun, Jack N.
Rachal, James E.
Radcliffe, Darrel R.
Radford, Garland L.
Raffel, Richard R.
Rafferty, Cleon H.
Rafferty, Michael E.
Raines, Arvel H.
Rainwater, Gerald K.
Raley, Jerry A.
Ralph, John "C"
Ralph, Nelson P.
Ramaker, James K.
Ramey, Perry A.
Ramirez, Joe P., Jr.
Ramirez, Roy G.
Ramsay, Jerrold A.
Ramseur, Joe D.
Ramsey, Bobby J.
Ramsey, Emma G.
Randall, David R.
Randall, David S., Jr.
Randlett, Frederick A.
Ransom, Morris E.
Rasile, Robert
Ratcliffe, Donald
Rau, Harvey L.
Ravan, George "A"
Rawlins, Malcolm S.
Ray, Glen C.
Ray, James F.
Ray, Philip H.
Ray, Robert E.
Ray, Thomas W.
Ray, Walter J.
Raymer, Erwin O.
Raymond, Dale
Raymond, Joseph C.
Raymond, Ernest A.
Reale, Frank A.
Redford, Raymond E.
Redic, Bobby D.
Redican, Thomas E.
Redifer, John L.
Redlinger, Robert E.
Reed, Chris D.
Reed, Doyle R.
Reed, Jack M.
Reed, Ralph W.
Reed, Thomas F.
Reeves, Ross N., III
Reeves, Walter A.
Rehmann, Lawrence M.
Reid, Dewitt R., Jr.
Reid, Gawn W.
Reifsnider, Lawrence C.
Reigle, Robert E.
Reigle, William A.
Reitmeister, William A.
Rembish, Stanley J., Jr.
Rempel, Robert H.
Reneau, Calix L.
Renegar, Edwin J.
Renfro, Luther L., Jr.
Renn, Earle L.
Renno, Robert "E."
Rantz, Homer A.
Rexrode, John D.
Reyer, Alfred J., Jr.
Reynaud, Junior G.
Reynolds, Albert A.
Reynolds, Charles D.
Reynolds, Donna M.
Reynolds, Oren C.
Rhode, Richard W.
Rhodes, Davey L.
Rhodes, John L.
Rhodes, Larry E.
Rhyder, Frederick V.
Rice, Edwin A.
Rice, Lewis E.
Rice, Luther E., Jr.
Rich, Robert E.
Richards, Clarence E., Jr.
Richards, Donald R.
Richards, Larry D.
Richardson, Donald F.
Richardson, Harold L.
Richardson, Herbert C., Jr.
Richmond, Arthur D.
Richmond, William A.
Richter, Robert E.
Richter, Robert L.
Ricker, Clarence J.
Rickman, Lester, Jr.
Ricks, Melvin R.
Ricks, Peter J., Jr.
Riddle, William N.
Ridenour, Robert L.
Riggs, Charles
Rigney, Michael A.
Riley, Carroll J.
Riley, Charles N.
Riley, Harold J.
Riley, Patrick A.
Riley, William E.
Rindt, Brian A.
Ring, Paul E.
Ringler, Dean R.
Ringler, Jerry H.
Ripa, Sebastiano F.
Ripp, Robert W.
Risko, William
Ritter, Harold L.
Rivers, Robert R.
Robbins, John R.
Roberson, James J.
Roberson, Thomas F.
Roberts, Leo W., Jr.
Roberts, Lewis C.
Roberts, Thomas E.
Roberts, Thomas G.
Roberts, Linton R.
Roberts, Frank H., Jr.
Robertson, Emmett L., Jr.
Robertson, John T.
Robertson, Roland G.
Robinson, Clarence A., Jr.
Robinson, Clifford R.
Robinson, George N.
Robinson, Neil H.
Robinson, Robert B.
Robinson, Robert L.
Robinson, Ronald L.
Robinson, William R.
Robison, David B.
Robitaille, Edmund A.
Rodgers, Carl L.
Rodgers, John J., Jr.
Roe, Jerry D.
Roettger, Raymond J.
Rogers, Cecil W.
Rogers, Lionel D.
Rogers, William S.
Rogers, Walter A.
Roland, Alex F.
Rolita, Edward J., Jr.
Rollins, Thomas E.
Romano, Robert J.
Romeo, Joseph F.
Romine, Donnie L.
Ronalds, Hugh A.
Rooks, Warren H.
Roos, Philip G.
Root, James P.
Roper, Clyde A.
Rosbe, William L.
Rose, Robert L.
Rose, William C.
Rosenthal, James H.
Roser, George R.
Ross, Leonard
Ross, Leonard H., Jr.
Rotchford, Edward P.
Rote, Richard E.
Roth, John W.
Roth, Mark C.
Roth, Thomas H.
Rothrock, Jack C.
Rotramel, Joseph R., Jr.
Rounseville, Peter R.
Rouse, Albert C.
Roush, Donald G.
Rousseau, Donald F.
Roux, Roger P.
Rowe, Carlton A.
Rowe, Guy F.
Rowe, Hugh T., Jr.
Rowe, Robert D.
Ruckel, William W.
Ruder, Eugene J.
Rummel, Thomas R.
Rundle, Randolph K.
Runer, Jimmy T.
Runkle, Roger L.
Rushlau, Gerald A.
Russ, Alfred B.
Russell, James C.
Russell, Hayden B., Jr.
Russell, Edward M., Jr.
Russell, Leonard D.
Russell, Charles E.
Russell, Richard S., II
Russell, William C., Jr.
Russell, Billy E.
Russell, Robert M.
Ryan, James A.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Sabattus, Donald J.
Sable, Ivan R.
Sabourin, Fernand H.
Sadler, Woodson A., Jr.
Sager, Hugh F.
Sakert, January T., Jr.
Salazar, Daniel M.
Salazar, Gerard
Salmons, Lloyd Y.
Salum, George D.
Sampson, Gerald H.
Sanborn, Richard S.
Sanchez, Milton
Sanders, James W.
Sanders, Richard K.
Sanders, Billy C., Jr.
Sanders, Stanley F.
Sanderson, Stephen H.
Sandoval, John, Jr.
Sands, Charles L.
Sanford, Eugene D.
Sangialosi, Samuel
Sansom, Howard D.
Santiago, George
Sarin, Mathew J.
Sarver, Edmond S.
Satterfield, Marion G.
Sauger, Peter P.
Saulnier, John L.
Saunders, Carleton F., Jr.
Savage, Charles W.
Savant, Richard L.
Savoy, Daniel R.
Sawyer, Harry E., Jr.
Sawyer, William F.
Saxton, Samuel F.
Sayre, Orville L.
Scalzo, Salvatore J.
Scarborough, Neil H.
Scarboro, Jimmy M.
Schauer, Theodore W.
Scheller, Leroy A., Jr.
Schiraldi, Anthony P.
Schlack, Carl J.
Schlapfer, Robert E.
Schleusner, Clifford G.
Schlitz, Leonard L.
Schlondrop, William C.
Schmehl, Lyle F.
Schmid, Adolph
Schmidt, Paul T.
Schmidt, Raymond H.
Schmidt, Charles W.
Schmidt, Michael E.
Schmidt, Milford D.
Schmitt, Robert G.
Schneider, Louie F., Jr.
Schneider, Roger J.
Schomisch, Erwin W.
Schooler, Bill M.
Schoonover, Adrian E.
Schoopaul, Elwyn K.
Schrader, Robert E.
Schriber, Edward C.
Schultz, Donald C.
Schultz, Frank W.
Schumacher, Herbert J.
Schuring, Clifford S.
Schuster, Harold R.
Schwanke, Donald W.
Schwartz, Henry J.
Schwartz, John P.
Schwarz, William O.
Schwarz, Frank H., Jr.
Schwarzer, Bob
Schweim, John H.
Scoggin, Phillip C.
Scott, Billy H.
Scott, David L.
Scott, Eldon
Scott, Harmon, Jr.
Scott, James L.
Scott, Jerome C.
Scott, Jesse M.
Scott, Keith A.
Scott, Norvel M.
Scroggin, Ronald L.
Seage, Frederick H., Jr.
Seaman, Arthur J.
Search, George B.
Sebens, Mervin L.
Seder, Elmer C.
Seipel, Harry H., Jr.
Seitz, James E.
Selby, Martin A.
Seliga, John V.
Sellers, James A.
Selleck, Albert L., Jr.
Seman, Stephen G.
Sepulveda, Benny R.
Sergeant, Louis E., Jr.
Sexton, Gleason A.
Sexton, William H.
Seybold, Gerald C.
Shafer, Ronald L.
Shaffer, James A.
Shampoo, Clayton L., Jr.
Shamrell, Richard A.
Shank, Paul S.
Sharrow, Edward S.
Shaughnessy, John G.
Shaughnessy, Joseph B.
Shaw, Donald R.
Shea, James J., II
Shea, Robert E.
Sheckler, Herman D.
Sheehan, John F.
Sheldon, William G., III
Shelkey, Lloyd E.
Shell, Isham G., Jr.
Shelton, James H.
Shelton, Jerry M.
Shelton, Jesse E.
Shepard, Dean S.
Shepherd, Thomas C.
Sheppard, John L.
Sheppard, Victor L.
Sheridan, Robert L.
Sheridan, Thomas J.
Sheridan, William A., Jr.
Sherron, Bobby L.
Sherry, Homer G.
Shick, Warren I.
Shifflette, Leonard R.
Shiver, Clements W.
Shiver, Henry D.
Shivers, Robert L.
Shoaf, Richard A.
Shoemaker, William E.
Shoffner, Mann, Jr.
Shook, Eddie H.
Shoop, Ronald H.
Shore, Richard G.

- Shough, John G., II
Shoutys, John J., Jr.
Shove, Louis D.
Shroyer, Russell E.
Shubin, Derek A.
Shulgay, Peter
Shultis, Dean G.
Shumate, Kenneth C.
Shupe, Franklin D.
Sickels, George, Jr.
Siemasko, Paul R.
Siemlon, Daniel L.
Sigmon, Billy R.
Siler, Jerry E.
Silk, Thomas E.
Simkins, Joseph R.
Simmons, Harry A.
Simmons, Warren A.
Simolin, Roy E.
Simon, Edward J.
Simond, Roger C.
Simpkins, "J" "V"
Simpson, Harvey H.
Sims, Jack
Sinclair, Harry L.
Skalski, Stanley A.
Skinner, Marion R., Jr.
Skrobialowski, Stanley C.
Slane, Thomas J.
Slate, James C.
Slavens, Charles R.
Sloan, Bobby B.
Sloan, Joe D.
Slocum, John J.
Smallwood, Gene G.
Smethurst, Robert J. L.
Smiley, Perry
Smith, Alexander G.
Smith, Blakeslee A.
Smith, Cameron M., Jr.
Smith, Carroll J.
Smith, Charles W., Jr.
Smith, Curry L.
Smith, David M.
Smith, Darrell M.
Smith, Don "L"
Smith, Donald F.
Smith, Donald J.
Smith, Donald W.
Smith, Earl F.
Smith, Frank E.
Smith, George M., Jr.
Smith, George W.
Smith, Glen D.
Smith, Guanie D.
Smith, Harold, Jr.
Smith, Harold W., Jr.
Smith, Herbert S.
Smith, James C.
Smith, James G., Jr.
Smith, James J.
Smith, James L.
Smith, Jessie E. Jr.
Smith, Joe F.
Smith, John R.
Smith, John R.
Smith, John R.
Smith, Kenneth F.
Smith, Lawrence W.
Smith, Lloyd M.
Smith, Marshall I.
Smith, Melvin L.
Smith, Ralph A.
Smith, Ronald L.
Smith, Ronald R.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, William C.
Smith, William E.
Smyth, Edward A.
Snead, John J.
Sneary, Paul L.
Snedeker, Charles W.
Snell, Leland N.
Snellings, Sidney L., Jr.
Snodgrass, Nathaniel I.
Snooks, Donald J.
Snow, Richard W.
Sobkowiak, Aloysius N.
Sojourner, Fletcher B., Jr.
Soldner, Charles R.
Soltes, Anthony J.
Sommerhauser, James E.
Sordello, Vincent A.
Sorensen, Martin
Sorenson, Neil R.
Sosa, Martin D., Jr.
Sousa, Ronald L.
Southall, James B.
Spacek, Lawrence L.
Spaeth, Leo M.
Spahr, Edward J.
Spainhour, Harold L.
Spalsbury, James A.
Sparkes, Peter A.
Sparks, Alan J.
Sparks, Billy R.
Sparks, John H., Jr.
Spear, Winfield A.
Spears, Leo E.
Speeg, Roger V.
Spellopoulos, Philip P.
Spellins, William R.
Spencer, Ralph D.
Spiczka, Robert A.
Spiker, Robert E.
Spikerman, Jack L.
Spillane, Raymond J.
Spinks, James A., III
Spitze, Robert R.
Spoonner, Robert L.
Springer, Dennis E.
Springer, Larry J.
Stafferl, John P.
Stafford, Donald E.
Stalcup, Gerald G.
Stamper, Thomas B.
Stanford, "T" "J"
Stanley, Jackie W.
Starbuck, James W.
Stashl, Donald I.
Statham, Dorrance E.
Staump, Frank A., Jr.
Stavros, Peter N.
St. Clair, Edward M.
Stebbins, Jack L.
Steele, Lloyd M.
Steele, Richard A.
Steeves, William D., Jr.
Steffan, William J.
Steger, Lester H.
Steger, Robert A. J.
Stein, Timothy E. S.
Steinken, William T., Jr.
Stephenson, Jack E.
Stephenson, Jack W., Jr.
Sterling, Earl W.
Sterling, William G.
Sternberg, John C., Jr.
Stetster, Raymond D., Jr.
Stevens, Danny H.
Stevens, Darrell T.
Stevens, Herbert W.
Stevens, Irvin J.
Steward, Ralph E.
Stewart, "J" "D" E., Jr.
Stewart, James N.
Stickler, Melvin A.
Still, Cornelius F.
Still, Myles C.
Stinson, Idus E.
Stirling, Gordon P., Jr.
Stitcher, Frederick M.
Stitt, Charles D.
Stockman, John A.
Stoffel, Donald F.
Stokes, Donald
Stokes, James C., Jr.
Stolz, Floyd L.
Stolz, Joe W., Jr.
Stone, Larry G.
Stone, Richard C.
Stone, Thomas
Stoner, Raymond E.
Stoops, James M.
Stote, Samuel E.
Stouffer, Thomas "D"
Stout, Arthur R.
Stout, Raymond H.
Stout, Robert R.
Stowell, James H.
Strassenberg, Donald E.
Strayhorn, Kenneth E.
Street, Douglas D.
Striano, John F.
Strickley, Benjamin J.
Striker, Frederick H.
Strom, Rawlin D.
Strong, Charlie, Jr.
Strong, Richard H.
Stroup, Guy S.
Struble, Richard H.
Strunk, Harry H.
Struwe, Lawrence T.
Stuckey, William H.
Stull, Willard E.
Sturm, Donald R.
Storsa, Raymond P.
Suarez, Charlie F.
Suhy, John M.
Sullivan, Charles A.
Sullivan, John J.
Sumrall, Tommy L.
Surles, Charles T.
Sutherland, Richard C.
Sutherland, Frank S., Jr.
Sutler, Lawrence L.
Sutton, Gerald F. L.
Svitak, James D.
Swan, Allan G.
Swanagin, Cecil E.
Swaney, David O.
Swanson, Donald G.
Swanstrom, Carl R.
Sweeney, Richard F.
Sweeney, Allen M.
Swindell, Harold W.
Swink, Richard M.
Swinson, James D., Jr.
Swisher, Charles E.
Switzer, Walter E.
Sylvester, Donald
Sylvester, Ira L.
Symolon, William P.
Synnes, Dale C.
Syska, Herbert P., Jr.
Tackett, Charles R.
Tafaoa, Togialuga
Taft, Norman F.
Taker, Lionel D.
Tallmage, George E.
Tandle, Thomas J.
Tarry, William E.
Tatum, James R.
Tausig, Joseph K., III
Tawney, William H.
Taylor, Aubrey M.
Taylor, Charles C.
Taylor, Charles R.
Taylor, David E.
Taylor, Floyd E.
Taylor, Gilbert J.
Taylor, Howard E., Jr.
Taylor, Kenneth E.
Taylor, Robert T.
Taylor, Raymond E.
Taylor, Steve F.
Taylor, Thomas F.
Tebrich, Charles D.
Templeton, Bobby A.
Templeton, Ralph D.
Templin, Charles J.
Tennant, Delbert M.
Ter Horst, Kenneth C.
Terrell, Thomas J.
Terrell, William K.
Tetu, Gerard P.
Thacher, Robert M.
Thacker, Darrell L.
Thacker, John L.
Thayer, Oliver, Jr.
Theriot, Jimmy R.
Thibault, Paul V.
Thomas, Benjamin G.
Thomas, Edgar D.
Thomas, Elmer L.
Thomas, Frank D.
Thomas, Jerrold A.
Thomas, Neil S.
Thomas, Stanley B.
Thomas, Velpeau C.
Thomas, William N.
Thomason, James W.
Thome, Richard A.
Thompson, Chester R.
Thompson, Gary R.
Thompson, George P.
Thompson, James B.
Thompson, James G.
Thompson, John C.
Thompson, John L.
Thompson, Lacy, Jr.
Thompson, Leon R.
Thompson, Melvin L.
Thompson, Thomas L.
Thompson, William F.
Thornton, Arvin L.
Thornton, Cecil R.
Thornton, James C.
Thornton, Joseph O.
Thrallkill, Allen B.
Tice, Martin A.
Tidwell, Edwin D.
Tieking, Harold L.
Tillie, Robert F.
Timmons, Robert W.
Tims, Franklin L.
Tims, Kenneth W.
Tinney, John G.
Tobin, Harry J.
Toepfer, Richard E.
Tofft, Charles N.
Toholsky, Ralph E.
Tolles, Oliver K.
Tomlinson, Jerry L.
Tomlinson, William G.
Toney, Edgar A.
Toombs, William E.
Torres, Ferdinand J., Jr.
Torrey, Robert W.
Toso, Chester L.
Toth, Albert A., Jr.
Toth, Francis A.
Toval, Ferdinand A.
Toy, John B., Jr.
Tracey, Robert L.
Trader, Harold C.
Trainor, Kevin F.
Treadwell, William E.
Treece, Wayne L.
Trott, Winfield R., Jr.
Trudell, Edward P.
True, Charles G.
Trujillo, Luis L.
Tucci, Thomas J.
Tucker, Fred, Jr.
Tucker, Jacques E.
Tucker, Robert B.
Tucker, Willie R. M.
Tuleya, Robert W.
Tully, Fred, Jr.
Turl, Donald R.
Turnbull, Walter N.
Turner, Frank L.
Turner, Thomas W.
Turney, Milas E.
Turse, Ellsworth J., Jr.
Twiddy, Curtis A., Jr.
Twiford, Richard D.
Tygart, Leonard D.
Tyler, Charles B.
Tyler, James E.
Tyler, James E.
Tyson, Francis D.
Underwood, Paul
Underwood, Robert J.
Unger, James J.
Urquhart, Larry J.
Usher, Lloyd J.
Vaart, Andres
Valdez, Michael F.
Valentino, John, II
Van, Arthur V.
Van Amberg, David E.
Van Antwerp, Lloyd H.
Vance, Allen L.
Vance, Ivan L.
Vance, Kenneth R.
Vance, Marshall C.
Van Cott, Richard C.
Vandenberg, Wallace E.
Van Der Does, Nicholas C.
Vanderhoof, Rex F.
Vandermark, Joseph D.
Van Druff, Roscoe W., Jr.
Van Hoose, Donald L.
Van Kirk, Theodore R.
Van Landingham, Thomas C.
Van Orden, William L.
Varnadore, William E.
Vaserberg, Morton
Vchulek, Joseph A.
Veater, Jimmie
Veigel, Robert E.
Venanzi, Vincent J.
Venuto, Chauncey D.
Verbanic, Francis E.
Vernon, David D.
Vestal, Lavon H.
Vickers, Robert E.
Vido, Ronald E.
Vignere, Samuel E.
Villarreal, Michael D.
Villeneuve, Joseph L. P.
Vincelette, Alan J.
Vincent, Richard L.
Visser, Eric P.
Volmer, Dorothy L.
Vultz, Richard A.
Volz, Edward G.
Voronin, Bernard B.
Voss, Curtis M.
Waddell, Howard L., Jr.
Wade, Gordon R., Jr.
Wager, Charles P.
Waggoner, William C.
Wagner, Charles I.
Wagner, James P.
Wagstaff, Jack L.
Wahl, Edward P., Jr.
Waite, Carol R.
Waite, Maurice G.
Walaconis, Donald B.
Walden, Robert A.
Waldenville, Alan W.
Waldron, John N.
Waldvogel, Irwin F.
Walker, Charles L.
Walker, Houston E.
Walker, James E.
Walker, Jerry E.
Walker, Loren E.
Walker, Laurence A.
Walker, Lowell A.
Walker, Mungo R.
Walker, Norman J.
Walker, Pierre L.
Walker, Robert G.
Walker, Willard C.
Wall, Thomas U.
Wallace, Bernie J.
Wallace, Richard H.
Wallace, William J., Jr.
Wallace, Virgil E.
Wallace, Robert H.
Wallace, Robert T.
Walls, George O.
Walls, William B.
Walsh, Donald F.
Walsh, Edmund E., Jr.
Walsh, Walter R., Jr.
Walter, Lowell W.
Walters, Clyde T.
Walters, Bud R.
Waltman, Robert, Jr.
Waltzer, Robert A.
Wamble, Bobby L.
Wapp, Glen E.
Ward, George B.
Ward, Joseph E.
Ward, Ronald E.
Ward, Thomas R.
Ward, William B.
Warnack, Arthur
Warne, Richard E.
Warner, Charles W. F.
Warner, Tholow A.
Warner, Virgle C.
Warren, Theodore B., Jr.
Waters, Calvin R.
Watkins, Price I.
Watson, Carl D., Jr.
Watson, Eric P., Jr.
Watson, Henry L., Jr.
Watts, Avron J.
Watts, Carl V.
Watts, Gerald A.
Watts, John C.
Watts, John R.
Watts, Everett A.
Weatherford, Delano C.
Weatherford, Louis E.
Weatherly, Richard E.
Weathersby, John M.
Weaver, Billie F.
Weaver, Billy J.
Weaver, John F., III
Weaver, James P.
Webb, Patrick J.
Webb, Richard D.
Weber, David C.
Weber, James E.
Weber, Thomas H.
Weckerly, William M.
Weeks, Robert J.
Weeks, Robert W.
Weeks, Sammy N.
Wegl, John
Wehrly, Frank E., Jr.
Weigman, Charles J., Jr.
Weikel, Darvin A.
Wellant, George J.
Weins, Charles J.
Welsenburger, James L.
Welborn, David E.
Welch, Alexander D.
Welch, Jerry H.
Welch, William H., Jr.
Weldon, Arthur J.
Weldon, Nolan W.
Welker, Daniel L.
Wellman, Daniel T., Jr.
Wells, Claire V.
Wells, Herbert D.
Wells, Howard R., Jr.
Wells, James W.
Welsh, Ronald R.
Wengeler, Lloyd J.
Wenger, William L.
Wenglare, William R.
Wenrich, John L., Jr.
Wentworth, Lloyd M.
Werbinski, Kenneth L.
Wesner, Howard F., Jr.
West, Carl J., III
Westbrook, Jack S.
Westbrook, Raleigh B.
Westerfield, Frank B.
Wheatley, James M.
Wheeler, Paul K.
Wheeler, Charles D.
Wheeler, John W.
Whelchel, Leonard A.
Whisnant, Donald L.
White, Billy D.
White, Billy K.

- White, Henry G.
White, Jacky I.
White, Kenneth T.
White, Louis L.
White, Robert L.
White, Robert M.
White, Thomas A.
White, Thomas L.
White, Vance E.
Whiteaker, Jackie D.
Whited, Robert L.
Whitehurst, Charles B.
Whitehurst, Willis L.
Whiteside, Donald A.
Whitting, William A.
Whitten, Dale J.
Whitten, Marvin A.
Whitten, Jesse J. M.
Whitworth, Jack R.
Wholley, Michael C.
Wickens, Alan E.
Widel, James O.
Widger, Richard O.
Wiggs, Robert N.
Wilbur, William J.
Wilcox, Neal D.
Wilcoxon, Edward E.
Wilder, Jack A.
Wiles, Earl K.
Wiley, Buford B., Jr.
Wilhelm, Murray R.
Willhide, Henry E.
Wilkerson, Kenneth J.
Wilkinson, James V.
Willard, Digby H.
Willer, Joe H.
Williaford, Cecil R.
Williams, Charles R., Jr.
Williams, George J., Jr.
Williams, Irving D.
Williams, James R.
Williamson, Leon
Williamson, Thomas W.
Williams, Robert F.
Williams, Samuel G., Jr.
Williams, Saville L.
Williams, Ted E.
Williams, Wilbur C.
Willingham, Donald
Willis, John
Willner, Hugh L.
Willson, Russell O.
Wilmes, Richard G.
Wilson, Arthur G., Jr.
Wilson, Carl E.
Wilson, Donald T.
Wilson, David C.
Wilson, John C.
Wilson, John P.
Wilson, Jimmie J.
Wilson, Jerry T.
Wilson, Kenneth L.
Wilson, Robert L.
Wilson, William H.
Wincentson, Bruce M.
Wingard, Marquis M.
Winkleman, Guy H.
Winkler, Fred M.
Winters, Harry L.
Wire, Sydney M.
Wise, Donald L.
Wise, Richard D.
Witham, Merton T.
Witsell, Michael J.
Witt, William J.
Witten, Harry
Witthoef, George H.
Woldyla, Wilfred P.
Wojciechowski, Pasquale A.
Wold, Howard A.
Wolfe, Howard C.
Wolfe, James F., Jr.
Wolfe, William C. E.
Wolfe, William M.
Wolford, Kirk S.
Wolverton, Charles F.
Wong, Nathan A. K.
Wonson, Myles P., Jr.
- Woo, Fang Y.
Wood, Albert F.
Wood, Charles M., Jr.
Wood, Charles R.
Wood, Dana J.
Wood, David D.
Wood, Samuel J.
Wood, William H. Jr.
Woodland, Edmund W.
Woodland, Elmo R.
Woodman, William E.
Woodral, Albert L.
Woods, Clyde E.
Woods, Gary L.
Woods, Henry C.
Woods, John L.
Woods, Robert J.
Woodworth, Evan K.
Woog, Peter A.
Wooley, Nell "R"
Woollever, James E.
Worcester, Floyd B.
Worley, Bascom C. S.
Wozar, Richard M.
Wright, Billy J.
Wright, Burl M.
Wright, Claude C., Jr.
Wright, Clyde V.
Wright, Eddie B.
Wright, James D.
Wright, James E.
Wright, James L.
Wright, James N.
Wright, Robert C.
Wright, Richard M.
Wright, William C.
Wright, William F.
Wulfeck, Floyd C.
Wunsch, Michael C.
Wyatt, James R., Jr.
Wyde, Clark H.
Yoder, Robert H.
Yon, Vee S.
York, James M., Jr.
Young, Arthur C.
Young, Austin Z., Jr.
Young, Earnest
Young, John L., Jr.
Young, Robert W.
Young, Virgil L., Jr.
Youngstrom, Nels C., Jr.
Zakian, John F.
Zalipski, John M.
Zeferjohn, David A.
Zell, Richard M.
Zellers, Jon L.
Zenns, Larry P.
Zettler, George A.
Ziegler, Delphinus "N"
Zimmer, John R.
Zimmer, Jerry A.
Zimmerman, James H.
Zoer, Dennis R.
Zorens, Roger D.
Zumstein, Charles E.
Zumwalt, Donald L.
Zwiener, Robert C.
Abbs, William E.
Acker, Bruce J.
Admire, John H.
Ailstock, Jack W.
Akers, Ervin E.
Alberts, Alfred B.
Albizo, David G., Jr.
Alexander, Arthur I.
Alexander, Frank A. F.
Alexander, James F.
Allegree, Patricia A.
Allen, Homer L.
Allen, Paul W.
Allen, Robert L.
Allen, Roosevelt, Jr.
Allen, Tim
Allison, Robert C.
Allman, Bonnie J.
Alnutt, Ronald H.
Ammons, Gene F.
Amos, Robert D., Jr.
Anaya, John J.
Anderson, Robert J.
Anderson, William E.
- Andes, James A.
Andrews, George E.
Andrus, Donald F.
Arbisi, Anthony R.
Arnold, Charles L.
Asselin, Raymond F.
Atherton, Robert O.
Ayotte, James A.
Baca, Francisco P.
Bady, James R., Jr.
Bailey, Charlie E.
Bailey, Tase E., Jr.
Bajkowski, Walter F.
Barkovich, Andrew R.
Baldwin, Donald G.
Baldwin, Grant H.
Balignasay, Ernest N.
Baltes, John F.
Banaszek, Henry F.
Bare, Curtis J.
Barfield, Jimmy C.
Baribeau, Robert A.
Barineau, Richard L.
Barker, Charles P.
Barker, Robert L.
Barlow, Gerald L.
Barotti, James W.
Barrientes, Hector
Barrier, Wade H.
Bass, William E.
Battista, Salvatore A.
Beard, Lewis C.
Beck, Arthur R.
Belflower, Herman E.
Belken, Douglas C.
Bena, David J.
Bender, Lawrence J., II
Bertram, Lois J.
Bickel, Raymond R., III
Biesinger, Frederick S.
Bigness, David D.
Bines, Walter G., Jr.
Bird, Theodore A.
Bishop, Richard J.
Blair, Donald W.
Blair, Gary A.
Blakely, George M., III
Blankenship, Dennis R.
Blass, Kenneth L.
Blivin, William C.
Bock, Robert A.
Boggess, Gary M.
Boggs, William R.
Bogniard, Robert A.
Boley, Jackson D. T., Jr.
Bond, George P.
Bornemann, Michael J.
Boston, Leslie W., Jr.
Botsford, Donald R.
Bower, John H.
Bowers, Daniel C.
Bowling, Ralph M.
Boyer, Paul L.
Bozelli, Richard
Brewster, Jerry R.
Briggs, Jerry J.
Branch, Billy T.
Brier, Franklin D.
Brookfield, Charles E.
Brooks, "J" "B"
Brooks, John V.
Brooks, Ronald D.
Brophy, Daniel R.
Brown, David T.
Brown, Elton R., III
Brown, Fred A.
Brown, George R.
Brown, Thomas E., Jr.
Broyer, Fred D.
Brozena, Thomas J.
Bruce, Gale E.
Buchholz, James H.
Buell, Edwin L.
Bullock, Delbert A.
Bunch, Robert F.
Bunner, Robert D.
Burcham, Richard G.
- Burford, George I.
Burkholder, Robert P.
Burlingame, Victor R., Jr.
Burnett, Robert D.
Burrell, Jack H.
Buser, Harry E., Jr.
Byrd, Thomas A.
Caldwell, Ronald L.
Cameron, Marion G.
Campbell, David M.
Canada, Ray G.
Candlen, Thomas P.
Capers, James, Jr.
Carlson, Carl J.
Carlson, Floyd A., Jr.
Carney, Robert A.
Carswell, Robert W.
Carter, Tommy A.
Casey, Jackie V.
Cass, Bert
Caudill, Robert E.
Cawthorn, Harvey W.
Cefall, Norman C.
Chandler, Herbert, Jr.
Chapa, Richard E.
Chase, Daniel D., Jr.
Chase, Jerry D.
Chase, Marshall C.
Chastang, Percy L.
Clark, Curtis R.
Clark, Leonard T.
Clark, Robert N., Jr.
Clelland, John P., Jr.
Cline, Rollin W.
Cobb, Oliver P., Jr.
Cofty, Huey C.
Cole, James W., Jr.
Collins, Charles B.
Collins, Charles G. T.
Collins, Donald C.
Collins, Geoffrey M.
Conti, Frank J.
Cotterell, Anthony J.
Cotton, David G.
Crange, Chandler C.
Creech, Keith D.
Crews, Billy D.
Cronin, Daniel J.
Crull, Willard D.
Cumber, Harry W.
Curry, Carl R.
Curtis, Albert
Cusack, John T.
Cutlip, Homer S.
Dale, Lewis I.
Dale, Wayne R.
Damon, Carl B.
Daniel, Johnny L.
Daniel, Walden L.
Darity, Martin H., Jr.
Darlington, Earl G.
Daskam, Walter C.
Daugherty, Richard C.
Davidson, William E. A., Jr.
Davis, Lawrence
Davis, Leon J.
Davis, Louis L.
Davis, Robert D.
Davis, Rodney F.
Dawdy, Lester L.
De Gennano, Anthony A.
Deichl, Richard J.
Delafleur, Christopher F.
Dennis, Richard E.
Detrich, Homer D.
Dey, Charles J.
Dial, Herman W.
Dickerson, Donald L.
Dillar, Curtis, Jr.
Dirks, David C.
Dixon, Isaac G., II
Dixon, Wallace W.
Dobies, Robert A.
Dockendorff, Gary D.
Dolan, Harry C.
Dollison, Dan P.
Dolphin, John J.
Domke, Walter
Donahue, Mary E.
- Donnelly, Gustavus L.
Doody, James W., IV
Dotson, Weldon L.
Doughty, William D., III
Doyle, Thomas J.
Drigg, John F., Jr.
Dube, Serge R.
Du Chaine, Lonnie F.
Dugger, James W.
Duncan, Gerald S.
Dunham, William E., Jr.
Dunlap, James V.
Dunning, Richard L.
Duran, Roy G.
Duree, Charles D.
Durham, Jerry W.
Dziedziec, Darryl F.
Eads, William C.
Econom, Samuel N.
Egan, Brian P.
Elchholz, William A.
Elder, Victor B., II
Ellis, Roger J.
Ervin, Sherman R.
Eshelman, Allen H.
Eskridge, William W.
Esposito, Michael J.
Ette, Robert J., Jr.
Eure, James L.
Everett, John R.
Fagersten, Gerald C.
Falcon, Alfredo
Farrand, Robert C.
Farris, Paul T.
Fayak, Bernard A.
Felner, Theodore K.
Feryan, James E.
Fey, Marvin H.
Fichtner, Thomas R.
Fields, Bobby J.
Filak, John J.
Fish, Charles W.
Fisher, Jeffrey M.
Fisher, Norman, Jr.
Fitzgerald, Charles J.
Fitzgerald, Victor K.
Fitzpatrick, John J., Jr.
Flores, Arturo
Floyd, Johnny M.
Flynn, Walter H., Jr.
Folgate, Henry R.
Forbell, Ronald J.
Ford, Douglas O.
Ford, Edwin C., Jr.
Foss, Donald L.
Foust, William N.
Fowler, Glen V.
Fox, Gerald E.
Franz, Joseph S.
Fraser, John H.
Frech, Roland A.
Friedl, Richard T.
Furer, Robert W.
Gagnon, Leo P.
Gainer, Richard H.
Gallagher, Cornelius J.
Gardner, Bernard E.
Gardner, Thomas R.
Gariboldi, Philip J.
Garoute, Jimmy L.
Garrett, Joe D.
Gaskill, Robert
Gates, Lauren W.
Gaul, Ray H., Jr.
Gearhart, Van F.
Georges, Robert J.
Gibbs, Walter M.
Gierczynski, Michael
Giles, Horace M.
Gillen, Catherine
Gilmore, Clayton S.
Gingras, Ronald "F"
Glass, Johnny M.
Goad, Daniel N., Jr.
Goewey, Virgil L.
Gorman, William M.
Gorney, Jerry E.
Gorton, Glen L.
Gortz, William M.
Goshey, Frank
- Gorzynski, Joseph A.
Grabner, George J., Jr.
Graham, Alan N.
Graham, Terry P.
Greathouse, Earl L.
Green, Frank N.
Gretton, Robert K.
Griffin, Roy L.
Grimsley, Richard A.
Grot, Robert E.
Grzanich, Philip A.
Guldi, Frederick X.
Habermacher, David I., Jr.
Hagans, Patrick C.
Hagen, Gunnar K.
Hamilton, William M.
Hammett, James R., III
Hamlin, Edwin A.
Hancharick, Joseph, Jr.
Hand, Kenneth R.
Hanrahan, Thomas J.
Hansen, Charles T., Jr.
Hansen, Richard C.
Hansford, George F.
Harden, Richard M.
Harlan, Herman
Harlow, Roger H., Jr.
Harris, Lee F.
Harrison, Wilbur H.
Hart, John T.
Hart, Robert S.
Hartman, Donald N.
Harwell, Patrick C.
Haskell, Richard P.
Hastey, Robert L.
Hastings, Sidney T.
Hawkins, Dale D.
Hawkins, Dicky E.
Hawkins, Emerson W.
Hayek, Thomas J.
Hayes, Gary P.
Headrick, Harold D., Jr.
Heald, Richard D.
Heaton, Billy L.
Helm, Joel K.
Helmick, James E.
Henderson, Richard W.
Hendricks, Charles M.
Hensel, Richard E.
Hepner, Stephen T.
Herak, James S.
Hughes, Richard O.
Hinds, Steven M.
Higbee, Larry T.
Hitte, Robert C., III
Hobaugh, George F.
Hobson, Robert M.
Hodge, George E.
Hodges, John A.
Hoffman, Charles R.
Hogan, Richard J.
Holley, Aubrey R.
Holliis, Harold D.
Holman, Arthur F., Jr.
Holmes, Billy R.
Holt, George A., Jr.
Hornak, John J.
Horne, David L.
Horrobin, William P.
Horsfall, William D.
Hostrander, Howard J.
Houle, George A., Jr.
Howell, Gatlin J.
Howey, William C.
Hudson, Jimmy "R"
Hunsberger, Robert S.
Hunt, Larry D.
Huntoon, Gerald D.
Hyland, Michael J.
Iacovacci, Michael A.
Innis, Donald A.
Isa, Ronald Y.
Ivey, James W.
Ivy, James E.
Jackson, Charles H.
Jackson, James W.
Jackson, William L.

Janssen, Richard C.	Leaverton, Shirley E.	Miskin, Edward T.	Plaskett, Alrid E.	Shearer, Robert A.	Tracy, Brandon L.
Jarrell, Roland, Jr.	Leblanc, Carl J.	Mitchell, James G.	Poe, Willard D.	Sheckler, Herman D.	Tracy, Normand C.
Jernigan, Charles R.	Ledger, Ralph	Mitchell, John A.	Poling, Lawrence D.	Shine, Thomas R.	Treon, William W.
Jewett, Joseph M.	Lee, Thomas W.	Moen, Dale A.	Pomichter, Stanley D.	Silen, Tony	Trippleton, Eugene M.
Johnson, James A.	Leininger, Jack L.	Montgomery, Michael T.	Poole, Henry J.	Sim, Craig S.	Tucci, Alan J.
Johnson, Martin B.	Lepak, Theodore W.		Pooler, William S.	Simmons, Clyde B.	Tunmire, David C.
Johnson, Richard O.	Lephart, Larry G.	Montoya, Cecilio	Poullot, Armand R.	Singer, William R.	Turner, Frank L.
Johnson, Richard M.	Lewis, Ralph	Moody, Rex B.	Powers, John A.	Slater, Robert M. S.	Turner, Joseph G., Jr.
Johnston, Bobbie J.	Lidyard, John A.	Moore, Clarence G.	Price, Ronnie K.	Smith, Aaron A.	Tyndall, William F.
Joiner, George L., Jr.	Lightsey, Reginald F.	Morgan, Jimmy B.	Pyne, Horatio E.	Smith, Harry R.	Tyynismaa, Robert R.
Jones, Jimmy C.	Lile, Brian K.	Morris, Allan R.	Quaglia, Joseph J., Jr.	Smith, Lidge W.	Uritescu, Jerry
Jones, John A.	Lincoln, John C.	Morrison, Irwin D.	Quebodeaux, Anthony P.	Smith, Ronald L.	Valent, Stephan
Jones, John L.	Linn, Robert F. K.	Morrison, John R.		Snodgrass, Russell A.	Vaughan, Isaac R.
Jones, Linza J.	Little, Fosterior, Jr.	Morrisette, Joseph R.	Ream, Edward P.	Sobotor, Francis E.	Vaughn, David B.
Jones, Lynn F.	Littlejohn, Jun D.	Morrissey, Paul H.	Rector, James S.	Sorrell, Jerry E.	Vaughn, James O.
Jones, Robert A.	Lonetti, Frank J.	Morow, Melvyn T.	Register, Charlton L.	Souza, Richard E.	Verecles, Federico T.
Jones, Sidney A., III	Longhouser, Garland A., Jr.	Moss, John C.	Reichler, James R.	Spalding, Vincent A.	Vigil, Leroy
Juck, Leonard P.		Moss, Michael J.	Rena, Thomas T.	Spencer, Charles W.	Visnick, Donald D.
Julian, John E.	Lovelace, William J.	Mosser, William A.	Reynolds, Trace J.	Spicer, William R.	Wahlers, Larry F.
Kammerer, Roger E.	Lowery, Paul J.	Mott, Robert J.	Rhine, John R.	Stagnaro, Charles J.	Walker, Marvin D.
Kane, Robert F.	Lukasiewicz, Frank W.	Moulder, John G.	Rice, Arnold A.	Stambaugh, Harold W.	Walkup, William D.
Kane, Robert J.	Luna, Albert	Mouton, Joseph	Richards, Edward T.	Stanko, Stephen J.	Walrath, Ernest H.
Kasparian, John P.	Lynn, Joel J.	Mowatt, Donald L.	Richardson, Kilburn E.	Stankosky, Michael A.	Walsh, Charles E.
Kearney, Brantley E.	Lyons, Donald E.	Mowry, George T.		Stant, James E., Jr.	Ward, Anthony L.
Keating, Joseph R.	Lyons, Joseph E.	Mullen, Richard H.	Richey, Ollen R.	Stanton, Lloyd E., Jr.	Wasson, Jesse R.
Kelter, Eugene L.	Machovec, Richard A.	Murdoch, Arthur R.	Rijfkoegel, Herman	Steed, Billy C.	Webber, Ralph L.
Keller, Clinton O.	Madden, Jimmie E.	Nauth, Paul G.	Rine, John H., Jr.	Steed, James A.	Welch, John H., III
Keller, William H., III	Maloy, Raymond L.	Nee Dels, Charles F., Jr.	Riser, Jerome E.	Stelman, Bobby	Welch, Stanley R.
Kelly, Daniel W.	Mahoney, Joseph F., Jr.		Ritenour, Donald F.	Stevermer, Brian M.	Wells, Darrell A.
Kelly, Joseph J.		Needham, Richard L.	Roberts, Harry F.	Stewart, Robert E.	Whipple, William L.
Kelly, Thomas E.	Mallon, George O., Jr.	Nelson, David E.	Roche, James J.	St. Denis, Harold J., Jr.	White, Herman
Kemmerer, Janet M.	Manning, John E.	Newman, Billy R.	Roepeke, Lyonel K.	Stilson, Frederick C.	Whitlatch, Thomas H.
Kemp, Bruce A.	Mannion, James P., Jr.	Norris, Gerald E.	Rohleder, William P.	Stimpson, Robert E.	Wiener, Thaddeus D.
Kendall, Peter C., III		Norris, Richard C., Jr.	Rooney, Phillip B.	Stock, Frederick J.	Wiggins, William C.
Kenyon, William O.	Marr, Joseph L.	O'Brien, James E.	Rothrock, Richard L.	Stockdale, James A.	Wiktorek, William A.
Kerch, Richard J.	Martin, Kenneth W.	O'Connor, Brian R.	Rudd, Claude T.	Stoltzfus, David S.	Wilding, James L.
Kichi, Edward P.	Martin, William E.	Odell, George W. T.	Ruddick, Morris E., Jr.	Stone, Gerald A.	Wileman, Charles R.
Kidd, Arthur J.	Marvin, Earl A.	Odum, James E.		Strickland, Ralph	Williams, Albert
Kilbourn, Frank D.	Mason, Frank R.	Ogg, Robert C.	Russell, Vincent B., Jr.	Sullivan, David S.	Williams, Marvin L.
Kiley, John J., Jr.	Matherly, Junior L.	O'Neill, Edward P. B.		Sullivan, Francis H.	Wills, James E.
Kilpatrick, John F.	Maxfield, Charles L.	Oquendo, Juan S.	Rusthoven, Bernard R.	Sullivan, Jeremiah J.	Wilson, Eugene S.
Kimberl, John D.	Mayfield, Herman P.	O'Roark, Alfred W.		Sumner, Donald W.	Wilson, Leroy L., Jr.
King, Kenneth M.	Mays, Arthur, Jr.	Osborne, Bobby L.	Ruth, John R.	Sutton, Terry D.	Wisdom, Hershel E.
Klein, Charles	McCall, Alonzo B.	Osborne, Phyllis S.	Rynne, Edward M.	Sweet, Cyrus C.	Wood, Larry A.
Klein, Harold D.	McCall, Jimmy E.	Ott, Clair E.	Sachse, Richard D.	Swidonovich, Eugene	Wood, Lloyd C.
Knagge, Joseph G.	McClinchie, Alexander, III	Overcash, "W" "P"	Saldivar, John G.	Swindell, Thomas E.	Wood, Millard W.
Knox, Earl L.	McConnell, George J.	Overton, Harold B.	Samples, John B.	Swinea, Larry C.	Wood, Myron C.
Koellin, Kenneth A.	McDonough, Donald H.	Page, Frederick H.	Sandmeyer, Robert F.	Sylvester, Gerald W.	Woods, James M.
Koiolek, John S.	McDonough, Francis M.	Painter, William R.	Schaffer, Robert K.	Sylvia, Joseph R.	Woodward, Robert L.
Kolb, Theodore R.		Paris, Robert T.	Scheetz, Paul V., Jr.	Tackitt, Loyce M.	Woodriddle, Debnay E., III
Kolek, David L.	McDonough, Francis M.	Parson, Charles A.	Schenck, Kenneth W.	Talley, Lee D.	
Koran, John G., Jr.	McGinnis, Harold S., Jr.	Pasleka, Stanley J., Jr.	Scherer, Melvin A.	Tanzer, Lowell E.	Wright, Howell F.
Korn, Ambrose E., Jr.		Pate, Eugene L.	Scheurich, John A.	Tanzey, Theodore E.	Wuest, Karl E.
Kozma, Joseph M.	McGlumphy, Mack L.	Patterson, James H.	Schlott, Robert L.	Tauber, Gerald L.	Wyant, Richard N.
Krawiec, Edward P., Jr.	McGrory, Patrick A.	Patterson, Robert E.	Schmidt, Gary M.	Taylor, Thomas W.	Yadon, Thomas L.
Krell, Frederick W.	McKee, Jack, Jr.	Patterson, Wilbert L.	Schmidt, Ralph C.	Terrell, Jack T.	Yost, Jere W.
Kuykendall, Paul G.	McLellan, Robert S., IV	Payne, Jimmy A.	Schneider, Charles J., Jr.	Thobols, Paul, Jr.	Young, Donald C.
Labarge, Roland L.		Peabody, Charles P.	Schott, Michael L.	Thomas, Dewey A.	Young, Louis L., Jr.
Labash, Robert D.	McLelland, James W.	Pearson, Ronald K.	Schuette, Charles E.	Thomas, John H.	Youngblood, Theodore A.
Lada, Samuel G.	McLennan, Donna R.	Pendas, Gerard G., Jr.	Schutz, Peter G.	Thomas, Paul R.	
Laferte, Robert W.	McReynolds, Jack L.	Peter, James E.	Scott, James H.	Thompson, Dallas E.	Zeitvogel, Joseph A.
Lainhart, Michael S.	McWhorter, Donald G.	Peters, William J.	Scott, Janice C.	Thompson, Don O.	Zerbe, Edward M.
Lama, Ivars	Mears, Donald E.	Peterson, Carl E.	Scott, John W.	Thompson, Jerry C.	Ziegler, Earl K.
Lambdin, Robert B.	Meier, Bobby L.	Peterson, Clark A.	Scott, Wayne J.	Thornton, William A., Jr.	Bromley, Austin W.
Lamey, Carl E.	Melson, David H., Jr.	Petrana, Michael N., Jr.	Scuras, James B.		Carr, William R.
Lane, Gerald S.	Meston, Ward B.		Seiple, William C.	Thrasher, David R.	Deaver, Richard
Larkin, Robert L.	Micucci, Charles P.	Pfeiffer, Frank L.	Sellers, Walter S.	Thrasher, Morris D.	Hagan, Stephen H.
Larrabee, Allen W.	Mielnicki, Walter M.	Primmer, Francis L.	Shahan, Billy J.	Tickle, Randall K.	Harris, Russell G.
Larson, John H.	Miller, August O.	Phillipp, James L.	Shandor, Joseph P., Jr.	Tidwell, John	Misemer, Frank G.
Latour, Leonard W.	Miller, Sherwood M.	Phillips, Lloyd G.		Tipton, Richard J.	Pase, Robert R.
Latshaw, Clarence C., Jr.	Minch, Harry E.	Pierce, Darvin D.	Sharratt, James R.	Toland, Owen J.	Teasley, Jack G.
	Minnis, Hubert T.	Pierston, Abel D.	Shaw, Oscar E.	Toma, Masao	Volack, Robert G.
		Pigeon, Troy J.		Tonack, Leland B.	

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1967

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 49th anniversary of

the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia. On this day in 1918, the people of this historic land proclaimed a free democratic republic, and during the First World War successfully defended themselves against both German and Soviet offensives, which resulted in the renouncement of all claims to the territory of Estonia. The nation then set to the task of expanding her agriculture and industry and promoting trade with other nations. In the atmos-

phere of freedom, the people of Estonia made great progress.

Then came World War II, and in violation of existing treaties the overwhelming military might of the Soviet Union and of Germany alternated in occupying this land and depriving its citizens of their freedoms, culminating in the forced incorporation of the country into the U.S.S.R. The United States and other Western countries have refused to recognize this annexation.